An Introduction To S-Structures And Defining Division By Zero

Brendan Santangelo

11/29/2016

arXiv:1611.06838v2 [math.GM] 29 Nov 2016

Original Submission: 11/17/2016
Address: Galloway, NJ 08205
Email: Brendan.Santangelo@gmail.com
AMS Mathematics Subject Classification Code: 08A99

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to emulate the process used in defining and learning about the algebraic structure known as a Field in order to create a new algebraic structure which contains numbers that can be used to define Division By Zero, just as i can be used to define $\sqrt{-1}$. This method of Division By Zero is different from other previous attempts in that each $\frac{\alpha}{0}$ has a different unique, numerical solution for every possible α, albeit these numerical solutions are not any numbers we have ever seen. To do this, the reader will be introduced to an algebraic structure called an S-Structure and will become familiar with the operations of addition, subtraction, multiplication and division in particular S-Structures. We will build from the ground up in a manner similar to building a Field from the ground up. We first start with general S-Structures and build upon that to S-Rings and eventually S-Fields, just as one begins learning about Fields by first understanding Groups, then moving up to Rings and ultimately to Fields [6]. At each step along the way, we shall prove important properties of each S-Structure and of the operations in each of these S-Structures. By the end, the reader will become familiar with an S-Field, an S-Structure which is an extension of a Field in which we may uniquely define $\frac{\alpha}{0}$ for every non-zero α which belongs to the Field. In fact, each $\frac{\alpha}{0}$ has a different, unique solution for every possible α. Furthermore, this Division By Zero satisfies $\frac{\alpha}{0} = q$ such that $0 \cdot q = \alpha$, making it a true Division Operation.

Introduction

An S-Field, as we will see, is a new algebraic structure that is an extension of a Field which contains an addition and multiplication operation that will allow for Division By Zero. This Division By Zero is very unique because its the only kind in which $\frac{\alpha}{0}$ gives a different, unique numerical solution for every possible $\alpha \neq 0$. More than that, we will see that this Division By Zero operation is a special case of a more general division operation called Division By Scalars. We will see that in S-Fields, this Division By Scalars operation is fully understood and that it satisfies many of the properties that one would expect from a division operation. Furthermore, we will see that an S-Field contains an addition operation which forms a Commutative Group. This means that the addition operation in an S-Field is also fully understood and that a subtraction operation can be defined that is fully understood as well. We will also show that multiplying by what we will define to be a scalar is also fully understood. We will then show that while we have found a way to divide by zero, we have not done so at the expense of giving up basic ideas about addition, subtraction, multiplication and division. We will see that most of the basic properties we would expect from these four operations carry over to S-Fields, with the added bonus of our new, one-of-a-kind Division By Zero.

A good way of understanding how we will accomplish this is to consider the following: Imagine taking a vision you have of a beautiful picture and turning it into a standard puzzle. Now, the pieces of this puzzle don't exist and so you must create them. Therefore, to turn this beautiful picture you have in your vision into a puzzle, you must first construct the puzzle pieces that will be needed. You construct their shape, their colors, the number of pieces, etc. And when you think you have a full set, you put the puzzle pieces together and see what the puzzle's picture looks like. The goal is to create a set of puzzle pieces that fit together and form the puzzle's picture that most closely resembles the beautiful picture you had in your vision.

In this analogy, our vision is to Divide By Zero in our unique, one-of-a-kind way. The material that we will use to construct the puzzle pieces out of will be S-Structures. We will shape the S-Structures by giving the multiplication operation in the S-Structure or the S-Structure itself additional properties. We will then color the S-Structures we create by proving basic properties about each of them. When we have created enough different types of S-Structures to make an S-Field and have proven all of the properties needed in each of them, we will start to put them together like the pieces of a puzzle. We will piece different types of S-Structures together, stopping along the way to prove important propositions about the S-Structures we have formed. We will first create Essential S-Structures, then S-Rings and finally S-Fields. When we have the S-Field put together, we will show that it can be used to define Division By Scalars and the Division By Zero we are looking for. We will also show an example of an S-Field to prove they exist.

1 Basic Properties Of S-Structures

It's time to lay out all of the introductory material that is needed for this paper. Since we are starting from the ground up, we define an S-Structure intentionally generic and lacking in multiplicative properties. This will allow us to build onto them by adding additional properties to the multiplication operation or to the structure as a whole. But to do this, a thorough understanding of the basics of S-Structures and of a few of their basic subsets is required. This section will get us acquainted with these fundamental concepts.

1.1 Intro To S-Structures

Definition 1.1.1 We define a **Santangelo Structure**, or simply an **S-Structure**, as an algebraic structure $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ where $\mathbb{S}$ is a set and $(+, \cdot)$ are well defined, binary operations on $\mathbb{S}$ which satisfy the following three conditions:

1) $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ forms a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.

2) $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is closed.

3) There exists $s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $0 \cdot s \neq 0$ or $s \cdot 0 \neq 0$ (or both).

We consider the operation $(+)$ to be addition and $(\cdot)$ to be multiplication.
Furthermore, we assume the standard order of operations, or P-E-M-D-A-S.

Remark 1.1 In an S-Structure $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$, by Definition 1.1.1, we know $(+, \cdot)$ are **well defined** operations on $\mathbb{S}$. Therefore, if $s_1, s_2, t \in \mathbb{S}$ where $s_1 = s_2$, then:

$$t + s_1 = t + s_2 \qquad t \cdot s_1 = t \cdot s_2$$

$$s_1 + t = s_2 + t \qquad s_1 \cdot t = s_2 \cdot t$$

NOTE: The properties in Remark 1.1 will be used frequently throughout this paper. As a result, they may be used without being referenced. Please keep this in mind while reading.

Proposition 1.1.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Structure.

1) If $s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $0 \cdot s \neq 0$, then $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is not Distributive from the right.

2) If $s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $s \cdot 0 \neq 0$, then $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is not Distributive from the left.

Proof: By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.
Therefore, we know that $0 \in \mathbb{S}$ where, by the definition of identity, we know $0 + 0 = 0$.

1) Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $0 \cdot s \neq 0$.
Assume that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Distributive from the right, then $(0 + 0) \cdot s = (0 \cdot s) + (0 \cdot s)$.
But we know $0 + 0 = 0$ and so

$$(0 \cdot s) + (0 \cdot s) = (0 + 0) \cdot s = 0 \cdot s.$$

Therefore $(0 \cdot s) + (0 \cdot s) = 0 \cdot s$.
By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.
Putting these together, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (0 \cdot s) + (0 \cdot s) &= 0 \cdot s \\ -(0 \cdot s) + [(0 \cdot s) + (0 \cdot s))] &= -(0 \cdot s) + (0 \cdot s) \\ [-(0 \cdot s) + (0 \cdot s)] + (0 \cdot s) &= 0 \\ [0] + (0 \cdot s) &= 0 \\ 0 \cdot s &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $0 \cdot s = 0$, which is a contradiction because we know $0 \cdot s \neq 0$.
And so if $s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $0 \cdot s \neq 0$, then $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is not Distributive from the right.

2) Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $s \cdot 0 \neq 0$.
Assume that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Distributive from the left, then $s \cdot (0 + 0) = (s \cdot 0) + (s \cdot 0)$.
But we know $0 + 0 = 0$ and so

$$(s \cdot 0) + (s \cdot 0) = s \cdot (0 + 0) = s \cdot 0.$$

Therefore $(s \cdot 0) + (s \cdot 0) = s \cdot 0$.
By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.
Putting these together, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (s \cdot 0) + (s \cdot 0) &= s \cdot 0 \\ -(s \cdot 0) + [(s \cdot 0) + (s \cdot 0))] &= -(s \cdot 0) + (s \cdot 0) \\ [-(s \cdot 0) + (s \cdot 0)] + (s \cdot 0) &= 0 \\ [0] + (s \cdot 0) &= 0 \\ s \cdot 0 &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $s \cdot 0 = 0$, which is a contradiction because we know $s \cdot 0 \neq 0$.
And so if $s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $s \cdot 0 \neq 0$, then $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is not Distributive from the left.

Corollary 1.1.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Structure, then it is not Distributive.

Proof: By Definition 1.1.1, we know that $\exists s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that either $0 \cdot s \neq 0$ or $s \cdot 0 \neq 0$.

1) Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $0 \cdot s \neq 0$.
Then by Proposition 1.1.1 above, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is not Distributive from the right.
Therefore $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is not Distributive.

2) Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $s \cdot 0 \neq 0$.
Then by Proposition 1.1.1 above, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is not Distributive from the left.
Therefore $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is not Distributive.

Putting this all together, we can conclude that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is not Distributive.

Since addition in an S-Structure $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$, we can list a few general properties about addition in $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ that apply to any Commutative Group.

Proposition 1.1.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Structure, then the following is true (see [3],[5]):

1) 0 is unique.

2) $-0 = 0$.

3) If $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $-s \in \mathbb{S}$ is unique.

4) If $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$, then $-(s + t) = (-s) + (-t)$.

5) If $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $-(-s) = s$.

We can define subtraction in $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ as we would for any addition that forms a Commutative Group.

Definition 1.1.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Structure where $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$, then we define **Subtraction** as

$$s - t = s + (-t)$$

We can also list a few general properties about subtraction in an S-Structure $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ that apply to subtraction defined in any $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ which forms a Commutative Group.

Proposition 1.1.3 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Structure, then the following is true (see [4]):

1) If $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$, then $s - t \in \mathbb{S}$ exists and is well defined.

2) If $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $s - s = 0$.

3) If $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$, then $s - t = -(t - s)$.

4) If $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$, then $s - (-t) = s + t$.

5) If $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $s - 0 = s$.

6) If $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $0 - s = -s$.

We will now define two very important types of S-Structures.

Definition 1.1.3 We say $(\mathbb{S}_F, +, \cdot)$ is an **S-Structure Extended From** $(F, +_F, \cdot_F)$, or an **S-Extension Of** $(F, +_F, \cdot_F)$, if:

1) $(F, +_F)$ and $(F, \cdot_F)$ are both closed in $(F, +_F, \cdot_F)$.

2) $(\mathbb{S}_F, +, \cdot)$ forms an S-Structure.

3) There exists a set $F_{\mathbb{S}} \subset \mathbb{S}_F$ and an isomorphism $\phi : (F, +_F, \cdot_F) \mapsto (F_{\mathbb{S}}, +, \cdot)$.

As the name suggests, an S-Extension of $(F, +_F, \cdot_F)$ is an S-Structure which extends $(F, +_F, \cdot_F)$ into $(\mathbb{S}_F, +, \cdot)$. In this type of S-Structure, $(\mathbb{S}_F, +, \cdot)$ contains a sub-structure $(F_{\mathbb{S}}, +, \cdot)$ which is isomorphic to $(F, +_F, \cdot_F)$. Therefore, $(F, +_F, \cdot_F)$ is contained in $(\mathbb{S}_F, +, \cdot)$ as $(F_{\mathbb{S}}, +, \cdot)$.

Definition 1.1.4 We say an S-Structure $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is **Commutative** if $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is Commutative. Thus $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Commutative if $\forall s, t \in \mathbb{S}$, we have

$$s \cdot t = t \cdot s.$$

For the purposes of this paper, there is no need to consider S-Structures which are not Commutative. While it is possible to work with Non-Commutative S-Structures, by using Commutativity, we can avoid unnecessary complications that arise while introducing S-Structures and Division By Zero. Therefore, we will primarily consider Commutative S-Structures for the rest of this paper.

1.2 Subsets Of Commutative S-Structures

Now that we have introduced S-Structures and their basic properties, it is time to introduce very important subsets of every Commutative S-Structure and the properties that make them important.

Definition 1.2.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure, then $\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{S}$, we define the set $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$, pronounced **$\mathbb{S}$ Sub Alpha**, where $\mathbb{S}_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{S}$ as

$$\mathbb{S}_\alpha = \{s \in \mathbb{S} : 0 \cdot s = s \cdot 0 = \alpha\}.$$

We say that $\mathbb{S}_0$ is the **Set Of Scalars** of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$.

Proposition 1.2.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure, then

$$\mathbb{S}_{\alpha_1} \cap \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_2} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_1} & \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 \\ \emptyset & \alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2. \end{cases}$$

Proof: Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{S}$.

1) Let $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$, then $\mathbb{S}_{\alpha_1} \cap \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_2} = \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_1} \cap \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_1} = \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_1}$.
So if $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$, then $\mathbb{S}_{\alpha_1} \cap \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_2} = \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_1}$.

2) Let $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$, then by Definition 1.2.1, we know $\mathbb{S}_\alpha = \{s \in \mathbb{S} : (0 \cdot s) = \alpha\}$.
This means $\mathbb{S}_{\alpha_1} \cap \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_2} = \{s \in \mathbb{S} : (0 \cdot s) = \alpha_1 \text{ and } (0 \cdot s) = \alpha_2\}$.
But since $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$, we can conclude $\mathbb{S}_{\alpha_1} \cap \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_2} = \{s \in \mathbb{S} : (0 \cdot s) = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2\} = \emptyset$.
So if $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$, then $\mathbb{S}_{\alpha_1} \cap \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_2} = \emptyset$.

Therefore, we have that

$$\mathbb{S}_{\alpha_1} \cap \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_2} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_1} & \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 \\ \emptyset & \alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2. \end{cases}$$

Definition 1.2.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure. We define the set Λ where $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{S}$ as

$$\Lambda = \{\text{Every } \alpha \in \mathbb{S} : \mathbb{S}_\alpha \neq \emptyset\}.$$

We say Λ is the **Characteristic Index** of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$.

NOTE: If $\alpha \in \Lambda$, then $\mathbb{S}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ and if $\alpha \notin \Lambda$, then $\mathbb{S}_\alpha = \emptyset$.

Proposition 1.2.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure, then

$$\mathbb{S} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{S}_\alpha.$$

Proof: Let $s_1 \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, then $s_1 \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda$.
Now by Definition 1.2.1, we know $\mathbb{S}_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{S}$.
And since $s_1 \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, we can conclude $s_1 \in \mathbb{S}$.
Therefore, if $s_1 \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, then $s_1 \in \mathbb{S}$ implying $\bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{S}_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{S}$.

Let $s_2 \in \mathbb{S}$, then by Definition 1.1.1, we know $0 \in \mathbb{S}$ and $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is closed.
This implies $0 \cdot s_2 = \alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}$ and so by Definition 1.2.1, we have that $s_2 \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.
Now this means $\mathbb{S}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ and so by Definition 1.2.2, we have that $\alpha \in \Lambda$.
So we can conclude $\mathbb{S}_\alpha \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ and since $s_2 \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, this implies $s_2 \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.
Therefore, if $s_2 \in \mathbb{S}$, then $s_2 \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ implying $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

Putting these together, we have $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ and $\bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{S}_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{S}$, implying

$$\mathbb{S} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{S}_\alpha.$$

At this point, the importance of $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$ and Λ should be apparent. We can break a Commutative S-Structure up into disjoint sets $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$ where Λ tells us which $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$ to use and which not to use. But there are other important properties of these subsets that will be used later that we will look at now.

Proposition 1.2.3 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure, then $\exists \alpha \in \Lambda$ such that $\alpha \neq 0$.

Proof: By Definition 1.1.1, we know $0 \in \mathbb{S}$ and $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is well defined.
We also know, by Definition 1.1.1, that $\exists s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that either $0 \cdot s \neq 0$ or $s \cdot 0 \neq 0$.

1) Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $0 \cdot s \neq 0$.
Since $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is well defined, we know that $\exists \alpha \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $0 \cdot s = \alpha$.
So we know that $0 \cdot s = \alpha$ where $0 \cdot s \neq 0$, implying $\alpha \neq 0$.
And by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot s = \alpha$ implies $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, implying $\mathbb{S}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$.
Therefore, by Definition 1.2.2, we have that $\alpha \in \Lambda$, where $\alpha \neq 0$.

2) Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $s \cdot 0 \neq 0$.
Since $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is well defined, we know that $\exists \alpha \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $s \cdot 0 = \alpha$.
So we know that $s \cdot 0 = \alpha$ where $s \cdot 0 \neq 0$, implying $\alpha \neq 0$.
And by Definition 1.2.1, we know $s \cdot 0 = \alpha$ implies $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, implying $\mathbb{S}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$.
Therefore, by Definition 1.2.2, we have that $\alpha \in \Lambda$, where $\alpha \neq 0$.

Either way, we can conclude that $\exists \alpha \in \Lambda$ such that $\alpha \neq 0$.

This guarantees that Λ always contains at least one non-zero element. In the next section, we will see why this is important. But for now, we will check out one last property that applies to every Commutative S-Structure and will be used later on to prove that $0 \neq 1$.

Proposition 1.2.4 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure, then $\mathbb{S} \neq \mathbb{S}_0$.

Proof: Assume $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S}_0$.
By Definition 1.1.1, we know $\exists s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that either $0 \cdot s \neq 0$ or $s \cdot 0 \neq 0$.

1) Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $0 \cdot s \neq 0$.
By our assumption, since $s \in \mathbb{S}$, we know $s \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
So by Definition 1.2.1, we have that $0 \cdot s = 0$.
This is a contradiction though because we know $0 \cdot s \neq 0$.

2) Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $s \cdot 0 \neq 0$.
By our assumption, since $s \in \mathbb{S}$, we know $s \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
So by Definition 1.2.1, we have that $s \cdot 0 = 0$.
This is a contradiction though because we know $s \cdot 0 \neq 0$.

So if we assume $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S}_0$, we get a contradiction no matter if $s \in \mathbb{S}$ where $0 \cdot s \neq 0$ or if $s \in \mathbb{S}$ where $s \cdot 0 \neq 0$.

Therefore, if $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Structure, then $\mathbb{S} \neq \mathbb{S}_0$.

2 Basic Types Of S-Structures

The next order of business is to give some substance to the multiplication operation in Commutative S-Structures and to the S-Structure as a whole. As stated before, we defined S-Structures to be intentionally generic. The only guarantees that we have with regards to the multiplication operation are that $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is closed and that $0 \cdot s = s \cdot 0 \neq 0$ for some s in the Commutative S-Structure. But in order to make the well defined Division By Zero that we are looking for, we will need to be able to say a few more things than that.

S-Structures are a completely new type of algebraic structure though. This means that many properties we will need do not exist and must be defined and thought of. In this section, we will individually define and explore one or two additional properties that can be added to Definition 1.1.1 of S-Structures. We will look at the definition of these properties, the implications of these definitions and note any important information that should be highlighted in the form of propositions and theorems.

2.1 Regular And Complete Regular Commutative S-Structures

We begin by defining two properties of multiplication in a Commutative S-Structure $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ that will be used to connect Λ, the Characteristic Index of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$, with $\mathbb{S}_0$, the Set of Scalars of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$. These connections will be vital when we begin to piece together S-Fields in Section 3.

Definition 2.1.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure. We say $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is **Regular** if $\forall s \in \mathbb{S}$, we have $0 \cdot s = \alpha$ where $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

Proposition 2.1.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure, then $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Regular if and only if $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{S}_0$.

Proof: 1) Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be Regular.
Let $\alpha \in \Lambda$, then by Definition 1.2.2, we know $\mathbb{S}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$.
Let $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, then by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot s = \alpha$.
Since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Regular, by Definition 2.1.1, we know $0 \cdot s = \alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
So if $\alpha \in \Lambda$, then $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ implying $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{S}_0$.
Therefore, if $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Regular, then $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{S}_0$.

2) Let $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{S}_0$ and let $s \in \mathbb{S}$.
By Proposition 1.2.2, we know $\mathbb{S} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.
And since $s \in \mathbb{S}$, we can conclude that $s \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.
Therefore $\exists \alpha \in \Lambda$ where $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ implying, by Definition 1.2.1, that $0 \cdot s = \alpha \in \Lambda$.

Now $0 \cdot s = \alpha \in \Lambda$ and since $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{S}_0$, we can conclude that $0 \cdot s = \alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
So if $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $0 \cdot s = \alpha$ where $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
This implies, by Definition 2.1.1, that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Regular.
Therefore, if $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{S}_0$, then $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Regular.

Putting this all together, we see $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Regular if and only if $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{S}_0$.

Definition 2.1.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure. We say $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is **Complete Regular** if it is Regular and $\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$, there exists $s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $0 \cdot s = \alpha$.

Proposition 2.1.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure, then $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Complete Regular if and only if $\Lambda = \mathbb{S}_0$.

Proof: 1) Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be Complete Regular.
Then by Definition 2.1.2, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Regular.
And by Proposition 2.1.1, this means $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{S}_0$.

Now let $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then Definition 2.1.2 states that $\exists s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $0 \cdot s = \alpha$.
So by Definition 1.2.1, this means $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ implying $\mathbb{S}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$.
And so by Definition 1.2.2, since $\mathbb{S}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$, we know $\alpha \in \Lambda$.
This means if $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $\alpha \in \Lambda$ implying $\mathbb{S}_0 \subseteq \Lambda$.

So we know $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{S}_0$ and $\mathbb{S}_0 \subseteq \Lambda$, which implies $\mathbb{S}_0 = \Lambda$.
Therefore, if $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Complete Regular, then $\mathbb{S}_0 = \Lambda$.

2) Let $\Lambda = \mathbb{S}_0$.
Then $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{S}_0$ and by Proposition 2.1.1, this means $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Regular.

Now let $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Since $\Lambda = \mathbb{S}_0$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$, we know $\alpha \in \Lambda$ implying, by Definition 1.2.2, that $\mathbb{S}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$.
And by Definition 1.2.1, this implies that $\exists s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ such that $0 \cdot s = \alpha$.
This means that if $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $\exists s \in \mathbb{S}$ where $0 \cdot s = \alpha$.

So we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Regular and if $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $\exists s \in \mathbb{S}$ where $0 \cdot s = \alpha$.
By Definition 2.1.2, this means that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Complete Regular.
Therefore, if $\Lambda = \mathbb{S}_0$, then $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Complete Regular.

Putting this all together, we see $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Complete Regular if and only if $\Lambda = \mathbb{S}_0$.

2.2 Coordinated Commutative S-Structures

Currently, if given two elements s and t from an S-Structure, we have no criteria to determine whether $s = t$ or not. In fact, we have no way of identifying or labeling an element in any given S-Structure. But if we could give elements a unique label, we could use that to determine whether two elements are equal or not. In this section, we will develop a way of identifying and labeling elements s and t in a Commutative S-Structure. In the next section, we will expand on this idea to create unique labels and develop criteria needed to determine whether $s = t$ or not.

Definition 2.2.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure. If $\mathbb{S}_0 \neq \emptyset$ and $\alpha \in \Lambda$, we say an element $q(\alpha) \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ is a **Base for $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$** if:

1) For all $\beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$, we have that $q(\alpha) + \beta \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

2) For all $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, we have that $\exists \beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $s = q(\alpha) + \beta$.

Note: Since $\mathbb{S}_0 \neq \emptyset$, by Definition 1.2.2, we know $0 \in \Lambda$ implying $\Lambda \neq \emptyset$.

Definition 2.2.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure. We say $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is **Coordinated** if $\mathbb{S}_0 \neq \emptyset$ and $\forall \alpha \in \Lambda$, there exists a Base for $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

Proposition 2.2.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure. If $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $s = q(\alpha) + \beta$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $q(\alpha)$ is any Base for $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$ and $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

Proof: We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Coordinated.
So by Definition 2.2.2, we know that $\mathbb{S}_0 \neq \emptyset$ and that $\forall \alpha \in \Lambda$, there exists a Base for $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then by Proposition 1.2.2, we know $\mathbb{S} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.
This means that $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda$.
But we know that there exists a Base for $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$, which we can call $q(\alpha)$.
And since $\mathbb{S}_0 \neq \emptyset$ and $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda$, by Definition 2.2.1, we know $s = q(\alpha) + \beta$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

Therefore, if $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then we have that $s = q(\alpha) + \beta$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $q(\alpha)$ is a Base for $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$ and $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

As you see, this gives us a way of identifying an element s in a Commutative S-Structure as $s = q(\alpha) + \beta$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$. But $q(\alpha)$, the way it is defined, is not a unique element. This means that if $\alpha = \beta$, then we don't always have that $q(\alpha) = q(\beta)$. This implies that if $s = q(\alpha) + x$ and $t = q(\beta) + y$ where $\alpha = \beta$, we CAN'T guarantee that $s = q(\alpha) + x = q(\beta) + y = t$. So we cannot yet determine if two elements are equal or not, but we're close.

2.3 Coordinated Commutative S-Structures With Standard Bases

In this section, for every $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$ in which $\alpha \in \Lambda$, we will define a base called the Standard Base. We will show that for all $\alpha \in \Lambda$, the Standard Base of $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$ is a unique element. This will enable us to not only label elements but also tell us whether two elements in the Commutative S-Structure are equal or not.

Definition 2.3.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure. We say $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ has **Standard Bases** if:

1) An element $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_1$ exists and is a unique Base for $\mathbb{S}_1$.

2) For all $\alpha \in \Lambda$, the element $q_0(\alpha) = \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1 \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ and is a Base for $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

We say $q_0(\alpha) = \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1$ is the **Standard Base of $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$**.

Proposition 2.3.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases, then $\forall \alpha \in \Lambda$, we have that $q_0(\alpha) = \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1$ exists and is unique.

Proof: Now $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases.
By Definition 2.3.1 above, this means that $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_1$ exists and is unique.
And by Definition 1.1.1, we know that $+$ and $\cdot$ are closed and well defined operations.

Since $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}$ exists and $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is closed, we know $q_0(1) + 1 \in \mathbb{S}$ exists.
And since $q_0(1)$ is unique and $+$ is well defined, we know $q_0(1) + 1$ is unique as well.
Furthermore, since $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is closed, $\forall \alpha \in \Lambda$, we know $\alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) \in \mathbb{S}$ exists.
And since $q_0(1) + 1$ is unique and $\cdot$ is well defined, $\alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1)$ is unique for all $\alpha \in \Lambda$.
Finally, since $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is closed and well defined, $\forall \alpha \in \Lambda$, we know $\alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) + (-1)$ exists and is unique.

By Definition 1.1.2, we know that $\alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) + (-1) = \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1$.
Therefore $\forall \alpha \in \Lambda$, we have that $q_0(\alpha) = \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1$ exists and is unique.

NOTE: This means that if $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \Lambda$ where $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$, then $q_0(\alpha_1) = q_0(\alpha_2)$.

Proposition 2.3.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases. If $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $s = q_0(\alpha) + \beta$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

Proof: Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$.
By Proposition 1.2.2, we know $\mathbb{S} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ and so $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda$.

Now $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases.
So by Proposition 2.3.1, we know that $\forall \alpha \in \Lambda$, there exists a Standard Base $q_0(\alpha) \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.
And by Definition 2.3.1, we know that $q_0(\alpha)$ is a Base for $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$.
Therefore, by Definition 2.2.1, since $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, we know $s = q_0(\alpha) + \beta$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Thus we can conclude $s = q_0(\alpha) + \beta$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

Proposition 2.3.3 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases. Let $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$ where we know $s = q_0(\alpha_1) + \beta_1$ and $t = q_0(\alpha_2) + \beta_2$ for some $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \Lambda_0$ and $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{S}_0$. Then $s = t$ if and only if $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$.

Proof: Now $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Coordinated with Standard Bases and $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$.
So by Proposition 2.3.2, we know $s = q_0(\alpha_1) + \beta_1$ and $t = q_0(\alpha_2) + \beta_2$ where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \Lambda$ and $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

1) Let $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$.
We know that $s = q_0(\alpha_1) + \beta_1$ and $t = q_0(\alpha_2) + \beta_2$.
Putting these together, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} s &= q_0(\alpha_1) + \beta_1 \\ &= q_0(\alpha_2) + \beta_1 \\ &= q_0(\alpha_2) + \beta_2 \\ &= t. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$, then we can conclude $s = t$.

2) Let $s = t$.
By Definition 1.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is well defined and $0 \in \mathbb{S}$.
Therefore $s = t$ implies $0 \cdot s = 0 \cdot t$.

By Proposition 1.2.2, we know $\mathbb{S} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda_0} \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.
So $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$ implies that $\exists \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \Lambda_0$ where $s \in \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_1}$ and $t \in \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_2}$.

And by Definition 1.2.1, since $s \in \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_1}$ and $t \in \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_2}$, we know $0 \cdot s = \alpha_1$ and $0 \cdot t = \alpha_2$.
Therefore $0 \cdot s = 0 \cdot t$ implies $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$.

Now $s = q_0(\alpha_1) + \beta_1$ and $t = q_0(\alpha_2) + \beta_2$.
And since $s = t$, we can conclude

$$s = q_0(\alpha_1) + \beta_1 = q_0(\alpha_2) + \beta_2 = t.$$

This means $q_0(\alpha_1) + \beta_1 = q_0(\alpha_2) + \beta_2$ where $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$.

Since $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$, by Proposition 2.3.1, we know that $q_0(\alpha_1) = q_0(\alpha_2)$.
By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.
Putting this all together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
q_0(\alpha_1) + \beta_1 &= q_0(\alpha_2) + \beta_2 \\
q_0(\alpha_1) + \beta_1 &= q_0(\alpha_1) + \beta_2 \\
-q_0(\alpha_1) + (q_0(\alpha_1) + \beta_1) &= -q_0(\alpha_1) + (q_0(\alpha_1) + \beta_2) \\
(-q_0(\alpha_1) + q_0(\alpha_1)) + \beta_1 &= (-q_0(\alpha_1) + q_0(\alpha_1)) + \beta_2 \\
0 + \beta_1 &= 0 + \beta_2 \\
\beta_1 &= \beta_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore if $s = t$, we have that $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$.

Putting this all together, we showed that if $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$, then $s = t$.
We also showed that if $s = t$, then $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$.
Therefore, we can conclude that $s = t$ if and only if $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$.

This means that if the Commutative S-Structure $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Coordinated with Standard Bases, we can label elements as $s = q_0(y) + x$ where $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $y \in \Lambda$. We can then use this to determine whether two elements are equal or not. However, we can use Standard Bases to give a different label for s other than $s = q_0(y) + x$. We will now explore this new label.

Definition 2.3.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases. We say $A = q_0(1) + 1$ is the **Base Unit** of $\mathbb{S}$.

Proposition 2.3.4 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases where $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $A \in \mathbb{S}_1$ exists and is unique.

Proof: Now $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases.
This means, by Definition 2.3.1, that $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_1$ is a Base for $\mathbb{S}_1$ and is unique.

By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is closed and so we know that $q_0(1) + 1 \in \mathbb{S}$ exists.
Since $q_0(1)$ is a Base for $\mathbb{S}_1$ and $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Definition 2.2.1, this implies $q_0(1) + 1 \in \mathbb{S}_1$.
By Definition 2.3.2, $A = q_0(1) + 1$ and by Definition 1.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is well defined.
Since $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is well defined and $q_0(1)$ is unique, we know $A = q_0(1) + 1$ is also unique.
Therefore, we can conclude $A \in \mathbb{S}_1$ exists and is unique.

Proposition 2.3.5 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases. If $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $s = \beta - 1 + \alpha \cdot A$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

Proof: Now $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases.
So if we let $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then by Proposition 2.3.2, we know $s = q_0(\alpha) + \beta$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

By Definition 2.3.1, we know $q_0(\alpha) = \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1$.
And by Definition 2.3.2, we know $A = q_0(1) + 1$.

By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group.
And $\forall s, t \in \mathbb{S}$, by Definition 1.1.2, we know $s - t = s + (-t)$, implying all together that

$$\begin{aligned} s &= q_0(\alpha) + \beta \\ &= [\alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1] + \beta \\ &= \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1 + \beta \\ &= \alpha \cdot (A) - 1 + \beta \\ &= \alpha \cdot (A) + (-1) + \beta \\ &= \beta + (-1) + \alpha \cdot (A) \\ &= \beta - 1 + \alpha \cdot A. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore if $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $s = \beta - 1 + \alpha \cdot A$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

Proposition 2.3.6 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases where $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$. Let $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$ where $s = \beta_1 - 1 + \alpha_1 \cdot A$ and $t = \beta_2 - 1 + \alpha_2 \cdot A$ such that $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \Lambda$ and $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{S}_0$. Then $s = t$ if and only if $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$.

Proof: Let $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$.
We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases.
So by Proposition 2.3.5 above, we know $s = \beta_1 - 1 + \alpha_1 \cdot A$ and $t = \beta_2 - 1 + \alpha_2 \cdot A$ for some $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \Lambda$ and $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $s \in \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_1}$ and $t \in \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_2}$.

1) Assume $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$.
We know that $s = \beta_1 - 1 + \alpha_1 \cdot A$ and $t = \beta_2 - 1 + \alpha_2 \cdot A$ implying:

$$\begin{aligned} s &= \beta_1 - 1 + \alpha_1 \cdot A \\ &= \beta_2 - 1 + \alpha_2 \cdot A \\ &= t. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore if $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$, we have that $s = t$.

2) Assume $s = t$.
By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is well defined and $0 \in \mathbb{S}$ meaning $s = t$ implies $0 \cdot s = 0 \cdot t$.
Furthermore, since $s \in \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_1}$ and $t \in \mathbb{S}_{\alpha_2}$, by Definition 1.2.1, $0 \cdot s = \alpha_1$ and $0 \cdot t = \alpha_2$.
Therefore $0 \cdot s = 0 \cdot t$ implies $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$.

Now $s = \beta_1 - 1 + \alpha_1 \cdot A$ and $t = \beta_2 - 1 + \alpha_2 \cdot A$.
And since $s = t$, we have

$$s = \beta_1 - 1 + \alpha_1 \cdot A = \beta_2 - 1 + \alpha_2 \cdot A = t.$$

Therefore $\beta_1 - 1 + \alpha_1 \cdot A = \beta_2 - 1 + \alpha_2 \cdot A$ where $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$.
This implies $\beta_1 - 1 + \alpha_1 \cdot A = \beta_2 - 1 + \alpha_1 \cdot A$.
By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 with inverses $-s$.
Also by Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is well defined and by Proposition 2.3.4, A is unique.
Putting this all together, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1 - 1 + \alpha_1 \cdot A &= \beta_2 - 1 + \alpha_1 \cdot A \\ (\beta_1 - 1 + \alpha_1 \cdot A) + -(\alpha_1 \cdot A) &= (\beta_2 - 1 + \alpha_1 \cdot A) + -(\alpha_1 \cdot A) \\ \beta_1 - 1 + ((\alpha_1 \cdot A) + -(\alpha_1 \cdot A)) &= \beta_2 - 1 + ((\alpha_1 \cdot A) + -(\alpha_1 \cdot A)) \\ \beta_1 - 1 + (0) &= \beta_2 - 1 + (0) \\ \beta_1 - 1 &= \beta_2 - 1 \\ (\beta_1 - 1) + 1 &= (\beta_2 - 1) + 1 \\ \beta_1 + (-1 + 1) &= \beta_2 + (-1 + 1) \\ \beta_1 + (0) &= \beta_2 + (0) \\ \beta_1 &= \beta_2 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore if $s = t$, we have that $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$.

Putting these together, we have that if $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$, then $s = t$.
And if $s = t$, then $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$.
Therefore, we can conclude that $s = t$ if and only if $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$.

This means that if the Commutative S-Structure $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Coordinated with Standard Bases, we can label elements in a two different ways. Furthermore, no matter which label we use, we have the same criteria for determining whether two elements are equal or not. However, we are not done there. We can also prove some important properties about multiplication with regards to the Base Unit and the Standard Base of $\mathbb{S}_0$.

Proposition 2.3.7 If $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases, then $1 \cdot A = A$.

Proof: Now $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases.
So if $\alpha \in \Lambda$, then by Definition 1.2.2, we know $\mathbb{S}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$.
And by Proposition 2.3.1, we know that there exists a Base of $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

Now by Definition 2.3.1, we know $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_1$ exists and is unique.
And by the same definition, $\forall \alpha \in \Lambda$, we know $q_0(\alpha) = \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1$.
Furthermore, since $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_1$ exists, we know $\mathbb{S}_1 \neq \emptyset$.
So by Definition 1.2.2, we know that $1 \in \Lambda$.

If we let $\alpha = 1$, we see that $q_0(\alpha) = \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1$ becomes $q_0(1) = 1 \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1$.
By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.
This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} q_0(1) &= 1 \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1 \\ q_0(1) + 1 &= [1 \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1] + 1 \\ q_0(1) + 1 &= [1 \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) + (-1)] + 1 \\ q_0(1) + 1 &= 1 \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) + [(-1) + 1] \\ q_0(1) + 1 &= 1 \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) + 0 \\ q_0(1) + 1 &= 1 \cdot (q_0(1) + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have that $1 \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) = q_0(1) + 1$.
But by Definition 2.3.2, we know that $A = q_0(1) + 1$.
Therefore $1 \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) = q_0(1) + 1$ implies $1 \cdot A = A$.

Proposition 2.3.8 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases, then we have that $0 \cdot A = q_0(0) + 1$.

Proof: Now $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases.
So by Definition 2.3.1, we know $q_0(1)$ exists.
And by Definition 2.2.1, we know $\mathbb{S}_0 \neq \emptyset$.
So by Definition 1.2.2, this implies $0 \in \Lambda$.

Let $\alpha \in \Lambda$, then Definition 2.3.1 also states $q_0(\alpha) = \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1$.
If we let $\alpha = 0$, then $q_0(\alpha) = q_0(0) = 0 \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1$.
But by Definition 2.3.2, we know $A = q_0(1) + 1$ and so $0 \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1 = 0 \cdot A - 1$.
And by Definition 1.1.2, we know $0 \cdot A - 1 = 0 \cdot A + (-1)$.
Putting this all together, we have $q_0(0) = 0 \cdot A + (-1)$.

By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} q_0(0) &= 0 \cdot A + (-1) \\ q_0(0) + 1 &= [0 \cdot A + (-1)] + 1 \\ q_0(0) + 1 &= 0 \cdot A + [(-1) + 1] \\ q_0(0) + 1 &= 0 \cdot A + 0 \\ q_0(0) + 1 &= 0 \cdot A. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have that $0 \cdot A = q_0(0) + 1$.

Proposition 2.3.9 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases where $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then we have that $0 \cdot A = 1$.

Proof: Now $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases.
So by Definition 2.3.1 we know $q_0(1)$ exists and is a Base for $\mathbb{S}_1$.

Since $q_0(1)$ is a Base for $\mathbb{S}_1$ and $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Definition 2.2.1, we know $q_0(1) + 1 \in \mathbb{S}_1$.
But by Definition 2.3.2, we know $A = q_0(1) + 1$ and therefore $A \in \mathbb{S}_1$.
And since $A \in \mathbb{S}_1$, by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot A = 1$.

Proposition 2.3.10 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases where $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then we have that $q_0(0) = 0$.

Proof: Now $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases.
By Proposition 2.3.8, we know that $0 \cdot A = q_0(0) + 1$.
But since $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Proposition 2.3.9, we know $0 \cdot A = 1$.
Therefore $0 \cdot A = q_0(0) + 1$ and $0 \cdot A = 1$, implying $q_0(0) + 1 = 1$.

By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverse $-s$.
This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} q_0(0) + 1 &= 1 \\ [q_0(0) + 1] + (-1) &= 1 + (-1) \\ q_0(0) + [1 + (-1)] &= 0 \\ q_0(0) + 0 &= 0 \\ q_0(0) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have that $q_0(0) = 0$.

Before we move on, we will prove one last proposition that will be used later in this paper.

Proposition 2.3.11 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Coordinated Commutative S-Structure with Standard Bases where $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$. If $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $n = n - 1 + 0 \cdot A$ where $0 \in \Lambda$ and $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

Proof: Since $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, we know $\mathbb{S}_0 \neq \emptyset$.
So by Definition 1.2.2, we know $0 \in \Lambda$.
Furthermore, by Definition 1.1.1, we know $-1 \in \mathbb{S}$ exists where $(-1) + 1 = 0$.
And since $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Proposition 2.3.9, we know $0 \cdot A = 1$.

Let $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.
And by Definition 1.1.2, we know $n - 1 = n + (-1)$.
Putting all of this together, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} n &= n + 0 \\ &= n + ((-1) + 1) \\ &= n + (-1) + 1 \\ &= n - 1 + 1 \\ &= n - 1 + 0 \cdot A. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $n = n - 1 + 0 \cdot A$ where $0 \in \Lambda$ and $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

2.4 Wheel Distributive Commutative S-Structures

In Corollary 1.1.1 of Proposition 1.1.1, we learned that every S-Structure is not Distributive. In this section, we develop another property that is similar to distribution that will be used to take it's place.

Definition 2.4.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure. We say $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is **Wheel Distributive** if $\forall s, t, r \in \mathbb{S}$,

$$s \cdot (t + r) + (s \cdot 0) = (s \cdot t) + (s \cdot r).$$

The idea of Wheel Distributivity comes from "Wheels - On Division By Zero", a paper written by Jesper Carlström in 2001 and published in 2004. In there, an algebraic structure called a Wheel is defined and used to explore division by zero. Wheel Distributivity is a consequence of this definition. Aside: A wheel is **NOT** an S-Structure because addition in a wheel is **NOT** a Group [1].

Remark 2.1 Now Definition 2.4.1 gives us a way of defining Wheel Distribution in S-Structures. But by Definition 1.1.1, we know that addition in an S-Structure is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$. Therefore, if $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive with $s, t, r \in \mathbb{S}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} s \cdot (t + r) + (s \cdot 0) &= (s \cdot t) + (s \cdot r) \\ [s \cdot (t + r) + (s \cdot 0)] + -(s \cdot 0) &= [(s \cdot t) + (s \cdot r)] + -(s \cdot 0) \\ s \cdot (t + r) + [(s \cdot 0) + -(s \cdot 0)] &= (s \cdot t) + (s \cdot r) + -(s \cdot 0) \\ s \cdot (t + r) + [0] &= (s \cdot t) + (s \cdot r) + -(s \cdot 0) \\ s \cdot (t + r) &= (s \cdot t) + (s \cdot r) + -(s \cdot 0). \end{aligned}$$

We can combine this with Definition 1.2.1, the definition of Subtraction, to conclude

$$\begin{aligned} s \cdot (t + r) &= (s \cdot t) + (s \cdot r) + -(s \cdot 0) \\ &= (s \cdot t) + (s \cdot r) - (s \cdot 0). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we arrive at an equivalent definition for Wheel Distribution in S-Structures:
We can say $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is **Wheel Distributive** if for every $s, t, r \in \mathbb{S}$,

$$s \cdot (t + r) = (s \cdot t) + (s \cdot r) - (s \cdot 0).$$

NOTE: We will use both forms of the definition. Please keep this in mind as we continue on.

Now that we have Wheel Distribution, a replacement for distribution, we can use it in Commutative S-Structures to prove a few basic properties.

Proposition 2.4.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Wheel Distributive Commutative S-Structure. If $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$, then

$$-(t \cdot s) = t \cdot (-s) - (t \cdot 0) - (t \cdot 0).$$

Proof: Let $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$.
By Definition 1.1.1, we know that $\exists(-s) \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $s + (-s) = 0$.
By Definition 1.1.1, we also know that $\cdot$ is well defined.
And since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive, by Definition 2.4.1 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} s + (-s) &= 0 \\ t \cdot (s + (-s)) &= t \cdot 0 \\ (t \cdot s) + (t \cdot (-s)) - (t \cdot 0) &= t \cdot 0. \end{aligned}$$

By Definition 1.1.2, we know $(t \cdot s) + (t \cdot (-s)) - (t \cdot 0) = (t \cdot s) + (t \cdot (-s)) + (-(t \cdot 0))$.
And by Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.

This means that

$$\begin{aligned}
(t\cdot s)+(t\cdot(-s))-(t\cdot 0) &= t\cdot 0\\
(t\cdot s)+(t\cdot(-s))+(-(t\cdot 0)) &= t\cdot 0\\
[(t\cdot s)+(t\cdot(-s))+(-(t\cdot 0))]+(t\cdot 0) &= t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0\\
(t\cdot s)+(t\cdot(-s))+[(-(t\cdot 0))+(t\cdot 0)] &= t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0\\
(t\cdot s)+(t\cdot(-s))+0 &= t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0\\
(t\cdot s)+(t\cdot(-s)) &= t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0\\
-(t\cdot s)+[(t\cdot s)+(t\cdot(-s))] &= -(t\cdot s)+(t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0)\\
[-(t\cdot s)+(t\cdot s)]+(t\cdot(-s)) &= -(t\cdot s)+(t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0)\\
0+(t\cdot(-s)) &= -(t\cdot s)+(t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0)\\
(t\cdot(-s)) &= -(t\cdot s)+(t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0)\\
(t\cdot(-s))+-(t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0) &= [-(t\cdot s)+(t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0)]+-(t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0)\\
(t\cdot(-s))+-(t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0) &= -(t\cdot s)+[(t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0)+-(t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0)]\\
(t\cdot(-s))+-(t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0) &= -(t\cdot s)+0\\
(t\cdot(-s))+-(t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0) &= -(t\cdot s).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $-(t\cdot s)=t\cdot(-s)+-(t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0)$.
But by Proposition 1.1.2, we know $-(t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0)=-(t\cdot 0)+-(t\cdot 0)$.
And by Definition 1.1.2, we know $t\cdot(-s)+-(t\cdot 0)+-(t\cdot 0)=t\cdot(-s)-(t\cdot 0)-(t\cdot 0)$.
Putting this all together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-(t\cdot s) &= t\cdot(-s)+-(t\cdot 0+t\cdot 0)\\
&= t\cdot(-s)+-(t\cdot 0)+-(t\cdot 0)\\
&= t\cdot(-s)-(t\cdot 0)-(t\cdot 0).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $-(t\cdot s)=t\cdot(-s)-(t\cdot 0)-(t\cdot 0)$.

Corollary 2.4.1 Let $(\mathbb{S},+,\cdot)$ be a Wheel Distributive Commutative S-Structure. If $s\in\mathbb{S}$ and $n\in\mathbb{S}_0$, then

$$-(n\cdot s)=n\cdot(-s).$$

Proof: Let $s\in\mathbb{S}$ and $n\in\mathbb{S}_0$.
By Proposition 2.4.1 above, we know $-(n\cdot s)=n\cdot(-s)-(n\cdot 0)-(n\cdot 0)$.
However $n\in\mathbb{S}_0$ and by Definition 1.2.1, this means $n\cdot 0=0$.
Therefore $-(n\cdot s)=n\cdot(-s)-0-0$.

But by Proposition 1.1.3, we know $(-s)-0=(-s)$.
This implies $-(n\cdot s)=n\cdot(-s)-0-0=n\cdot(-s)$.
Therefore, we have that $-(n\cdot s)=n\cdot(-s)$.

Proposition 2.4.2 Let $(\mathbb{S},+,\cdot)$ be a Wheel Distributive Commutative S-Structure where $0\in\mathbb{S}_0$. If $s,t\in\mathbb{S}$, then

$$(-s)\cdot(-t)=(s\cdot t)-[(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)+(s\cdot 0)+(s\cdot 0)].$$

Proof: Let $s,t\in\mathbb{S}$.
Since $(\mathbb{S},+,\cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive, by Definition 2.4.1, we know that $\forall s,t,r\in\mathbb{S}$,

$$s\cdot(t+r)+(s\cdot 0)=(s\cdot t)+(s\cdot r).$$

By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S},+)$ forms a Commutative Group with inverses $-s$.
By Definition 1.1.1, we also know $-s\in\mathbb{S}$ exists and $\cdot$ is well defined.

Putting all of this together, along with Definition 1.1.2 of Subtraction, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
t+(-t) &= 0\\
(-s)\cdot(t+(-t)) &= (-s)\cdot 0\\
((-s)\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot(-t))-((-s)\cdot 0) &= (-s)\cdot 0\\
((-s)\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot(-t))+-((-s)\cdot 0) &= (-s)\cdot 0\\
[((-s)\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot(-t))+-((-s)\cdot 0)]+((-s)\cdot 0) &= ((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0)\\
((-s)\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot(-t))+[-((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0)] &= ((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0)\\
((-s)\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot(-t))+0 &= ((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0)\\
((-s)\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot(-t)) &= ((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we've shown $((-s)\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot(-t))=((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0)$.

By Proposition 2.4.1, we know $-(s\cdot t)=(-s)\cdot t-(0\cdot t)-(0\cdot t)$.
Again since $(\mathbb{S},+)$ forms a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-(s\cdot t) &= (-s)\cdot t-(0\cdot t)-(0\cdot t)\\
-(s\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t) &= [(-s)\cdot t-(0\cdot t)-(0\cdot t)]+(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)\\
-(s\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t) &= (-s)\cdot t+[-(0\cdot t)-(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)]\\
-(s\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t) &= (-s)\cdot t+0\\
-(s\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t) &= (-s)\cdot t.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting that into $((-s)\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot(-t))=((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0)$, we see

$$\begin{aligned}
((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0) &= [(-s)\cdot t]+((-s)\cdot(-t))\\
((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0) &= [-(s\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)]+((-s)\cdot(-t))\\
(s\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0) &= (s\cdot t)+[-(s\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t))+((-s)\cdot(-t)]\\
(s\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0) &= [(s\cdot t)+-(s\cdot t)]+(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot(-t))\\
(s\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0) &= 0+(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot(-t))\\
(s\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0) &= (0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot(-t))\\
-(0\cdot t)-(0\cdot t)+(s\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0) &= -(0\cdot t)-(0\cdot t)+[(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot(-t))]\\
-(0\cdot t)-(0\cdot t)+(s\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0) &= [-(0\cdot t)-(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)]+((-s)\cdot(-t))\\
-(0\cdot t)-(0\cdot t)+(s\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0) &= 0+((-s)\cdot(-t))\\
-(0\cdot t)-(0\cdot t)+(s\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0) &= ((-s)\cdot(-t))\\
(s\cdot t)+[-(0\cdot t)-(0\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0)] &= (-s)\cdot(-t).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $(-s)\cdot(-t)=(s\cdot t)+[-(0\cdot t)-(0\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0)]$.
But by Corollary 2.4.1, since $0\in\mathbb{S}_0$, we know that $(-s)\cdot 0=-(s\cdot 0)$.
This implies

$$\begin{aligned}
(-s)\cdot(-t) &= (s\cdot t)+[-(0\cdot t)-(0\cdot t)+((-s)\cdot 0)+((-s)\cdot 0)]\\
&= (s\cdot t)+[-(0\cdot t)-(0\cdot t)-(s\cdot 0)-(s\cdot 0)].
\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 1.1.2, we know that $\forall a,b\in\mathbb{S}$, we have $-a-b=-(a+b)$ implying

$$\begin{aligned}
(-s)\cdot(-t) &= (s\cdot t)+[-(0\cdot t)-(0\cdot t)-(s\cdot 0)-(s\cdot 0)]]\\
&= (s\cdot t)-[(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)+(s\cdot 0)+(s\cdot 0)].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\forall s,t\in\mathbb{S}$, we have that $(-s)\cdot(-t)=(s\cdot t)-[(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)+(s\cdot 0)+(s\cdot 0)]$.

Corollary 2.4.2 Let $(\mathbb{S},+,\cdot)$ be a Wheel Distributive S-Structure where $0\in\mathbb{S}_0$. If $m,n\in\mathbb{S}_0$, then

$$(-m)\cdot(-n)=m\cdot n.$$

Proof: Now $(\mathbb{S},+,\cdot)$ is a Wheel Distributive Commutative S-Structure with $0\in\mathbb{S}_0$.
Let $s,t\in\mathbb{S}$, then by Proposition 2.4.2 above, we know

$$(-s)\cdot(-t)=(s\cdot t)-[(0\cdot t)+(0\cdot t)+(s\cdot 0)+(s\cdot 0)].$$

Let $s = m$ and $t = n$ where $m, n \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Then by Definition 1.2.1, we know $s \cdot 0 = m \cdot 0 = 0$ and $0 \cdot t = 0 \cdot n = 0$.
By substituting that in, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}(-m) \cdot (-n) &= (m \cdot n) - [(0 \cdot n) + (0 \cdot n) + (m \cdot 0) + (m \cdot 0)] \\ &= (m \cdot n) - [0 + 0 + 0 + 0]. \\ &= (m \cdot n) - 0.\end{aligned}$$

And by Proposition 1.1.3, we know that $(m \cdot n) - 0 = (m \cdot n)$.
This implies

$$\begin{aligned}(-m) \cdot (-n) &= (m \cdot n) - 0 \\ &= m \cdot n.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore if $m, n \in \mathbb{S}_0$, we have $(-m) \cdot (-n) = m \cdot n$.

We will now show an important connection between Wheel Distributive Commutative S-Structures and Coordinated Commutative S-Structures. This is such an important connection that we will present this information as our first theorem and not as a proposition.

Proposition 2.4.3 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Wheel Distributive Commutative S-Structure where $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$. If $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, then $\forall \beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$, we have $s + \beta \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

Proof: Let $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, then by Definition 1.2.1, we know that $\alpha = 0 \cdot s$.
And by Definition 1.2.1, we also know that $\forall \beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$, we have $0 \cdot \beta = 0$.
Combining this with the definition of identity, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &= 0 \cdot s \\ &= 0 \cdot s + 0 \\ &= 0 \cdot s + 0 \cdot \beta.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\alpha = 0 \cdot s + 0 \cdot \beta$.
But $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive, so by Definition 2.4.1, we know

$$0 \cdot s + 0 \cdot \beta = 0 \cdot (s + \beta) + (0 \cdot 0).$$

But $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot 0 = 0$.
And with the definition of identity, we see

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &= 0 \cdot s + 0 \cdot \beta \\ &= 0 \cdot (s + \beta) + (0 \cdot 0) \\ &= 0 \cdot (s + \beta) + 0 \\ &= 0 \cdot (s + \beta).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\alpha = 0 \cdot (s + \beta)$.
But by Definition 1.2.1, since $\alpha = 0 \cdot (s + \beta)$, we know $s + \beta \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.
And so if $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, then $\forall \beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$, we have $s + \beta \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

Proposition 2.4.4 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Wheel Distributive Commutative S-Structure where $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$. If $s, t \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, then $\exists \beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $t = s + \beta$.

Proof: Let $s, t \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, then by Definition 1.2.1, we know $\alpha = 0 \cdot s = 0 \cdot t$.
By Proposition 1.1.2, since $s \in \mathbb{S}$, we know $-s \in \mathbb{S}$ is unique.
And so $(0 \cdot s) = \alpha$ implies $-(0 \cdot s) = -\alpha$.
This means $-(0 \cdot s) + (0 \cdot t) = -\alpha + \alpha = 0$.

Now we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is a Wheel Distributive Commutative S-Structure with $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
So by Corollary 2.4.1, we know $-(0 \cdot s) = 0 \cdot (-s)$.
This means that $0 = -(0 \cdot s) + (0 \cdot t) = (0 \cdot (-s)) + (0 \cdot t)$.

So by Definition 2.4.1, this implies $(0 \cdot (-s)) + (0 \cdot t) = 0 \cdot ((-s) + t) + (0 \cdot 0)$.
But $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot 0 = 0$.
Combining this with the definition of identity, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (0 \cdot (-s)) + (0 \cdot t) \\ &= 0 \cdot ((-s) + t) + (0 \cdot 0) \\ &= 0 \cdot ((-s) + t) + 0 \\ &= 0 \cdot ((-s) + t). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $0 \cdot ((-s) + t) = 0$ and so by Definition 1.2.1, this implies $(-s) + t \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
This means that $\exists \beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $(-s) + t = \beta$.

By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.
Putting these together, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (-s) + t &= \beta \\ s + ((-s) + t) &= s + \beta \\ (s + (-s)) + t &= s + \beta \\ 0 + t &= s + \beta \\ t &= s + \beta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore if $s, t \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, then $\exists \beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $t = s + \beta$.

Theorem 2.4.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Wheel Distributive Commutative S-Structure where $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then it is Coordinated.

Proof: We know that $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, implying, by Definition 1.2.1, that $\mathbb{S}_0 \neq \emptyset$.
And since $\mathbb{S}_0 \neq \emptyset$, by Definition 1.2.2, we know $0 \in \Lambda$ implying $\Lambda \neq \emptyset$.
Let $\alpha \in \Lambda$, then again by Definition 1.2.2, we know $\mathbb{S}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$.
Let $q(\alpha) \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ be any element in $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

Now $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive where $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
So by Proposition 2.4.3, $\forall \beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$, we have that $q(\alpha) + \beta \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.
And by Proposition 2.4.4, if $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, then $\exists \beta_0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $s = q(\alpha) + \beta_0$.

Putting all of this together, we have $\mathbb{S}_0 \neq \emptyset$ and if $\alpha \in \Lambda$, then $\exists q(\alpha) \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ where
1) $\forall \beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$, we have that $q(\alpha) + \beta \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.
2) $\forall s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, we have that $\exists \beta_0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $s = q(\alpha) + \beta_0$.

By Definition 2.2.1, this implies that $q(\alpha)$ is a Base of $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$.
Therefore $\mathbb{S}_0 \neq \emptyset$ and $\forall \alpha \in \Lambda$, there exists a Base of $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$.
And so by Definition 2.2.2, we can conclude that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Coordinated.

So if we know that an S-Structure is Wheel Distributive, then right away we know that it is also Coordinated. This means that when we put together an S-Field, we will not need to assume both. Assuming only Wheel Distribution will suffice.

2.5 S-Associative Commutative S-Structures

We know that an S-Structure is not Distributive, but what about associativity? Let us begin by exploring this question.

Proposition 2.5.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Structure where $s \in \mathbb{S}_1$ and $0, 1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $0 \neq 1$, then $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is not Associative.

Proof: Let $s \in \mathbb{S}_1$ and $0, 1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $0 \neq 1$.
Since $s \in \mathbb{S}_1$, by Definition 1.2.1, we know $s \cdot 0 = 1$.
And since $0, 1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot 0 = 0$ and $0 \cdot 1 = 0$.

Therefore, we have the following:

$$s \cdot (0 \cdot 0) = s \cdot 0 = 1.$$
$$(s \cdot 0) \cdot 0 = 1 \cdot 0 = 0.$$

However, since $0 \neq 1$, we can conclude that $(s \cdot 0) \cdot x \neq s \cdot (0 \cdot x)$.
This implies that $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is not Associative.

The above proposition gives us criteria which we can use to show an S-Structure is not Associative. As it turns out, we will see that an S-Field will satisfy this criteria and is therefore not Associative. This means that, just as we did with Wheel Distribution, we must develop another type of Associative property that can be used in place of the Associative property that we will lack.

Definition 2.5.1 We say a Commutative S-Structure $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is **S-Associative** if $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $\forall s \in \mathbb{S}$, we have

$$m \cdot (n \cdot s) = (m \cdot n) \cdot s - ([(m-1) \cdot (n-1)] \cdot (0 \cdot s)).$$

This gives us a very good replacement. The following propositions will show us why this is so.

Proposition 2.5.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Associative Commutative S-Structure, then $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $\forall s \in \mathbb{S}$, we have

$$m \cdot (n \cdot s) = n \cdot (m \cdot s).$$

Proof: Let $m, n \in \Lambda$ and $s \in \mathbb{S}$.
Since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is S-Associative, by Definition 2.5.1, we know

$$m \cdot (n \cdot s) = (m \cdot n) \cdot s - ([(m-1) \cdot (n-1)] \cdot (0 \cdot s)).$$

And since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is S-Associative, again by Definition 2.5.1, we know that

$$n \cdot (m \cdot s) = (n \cdot m) \cdot s - ([(n-1) \cdot (m-1)] \cdot (0 \cdot s)).$$

However since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Commutative, by Definition 1.1.4, we know $m \cdot n = n \cdot m$.
We also know, by Definition 1.1.4, that $(m-1) \cdot (n-1) = (n-1) \cdot (m-1)$.
This all means that

$$\begin{aligned} m \cdot (n \cdot s) &= (m \cdot n) \cdot s - ([(m-1) \cdot (n-1)] \cdot (0 \cdot s)) \\ &= (n \cdot m) \cdot s - ([(m-1) \cdot (n-1)] \cdot (0 \cdot s)) \\ &= (n \cdot m) \cdot s - ([(n-1) \cdot (m-1)] \cdot (0 \cdot s)) \\ &= n \cdot (m \cdot s). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $m \cdot (n \cdot s) = n \cdot (m \cdot s)$.

Proposition 2.5.3 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \dot{)}$ be an S-Associative Commutative S-Structure, then $\forall x \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $\forall s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, we have that $x \cdot s \in \mathbb{S}_{x \cdot \alpha}$.

Proof: Let $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ and $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot s = \alpha$.
By Definition 1.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is well defined implying $x \cdot (0 \cdot s) = x \cdot \alpha$.

Since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is S-Associative, by Proposition 2.5.2, we know $x \cdot (0 \cdot s) = 0 \cdot (x \cdot s)$.
But $x \cdot (0 \cdot s) = x \cdot \alpha$ implying $0 \cdot (x \cdot s) = x \cdot \alpha$.
And so by Definition 1.2.1, we have that $0 \cdot (x \cdot s) = x \cdot \alpha$ implies $x \cdot s \in \mathbb{S}_{x \cdot \alpha}$.
Therefore, $\forall x \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $\forall s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, we have that $x \cdot s \in \mathbb{S}_{x \cdot \alpha}$.

2.6 Commutative S-Structures With Unity

In this section, we will explore S-Structures with a multiplication operation that has an identity element.

Definition 2.6.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure. We say $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an **S-Structure with Unity** if $\exists e \in \Lambda$ called the **Unity** of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$, or **Identity of** $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$, where $\forall s \in \mathbb{S}$ we have

$$e \cdot s = s \cdot e = s.$$

Proposition 2.6.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure with Unity, then e is unique.

Proof: Assume $e, e_1 \in \mathbb{S}$ are Identities of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$.
Since e is an Identity of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$, by Definition 2.6.1, $\forall s \in \mathbb{S}$, we have $e \cdot s = s \cdot e = s$.
Let $s = e_1$, then we have $e \cdot e_1 = e_1 \cdot e = e_1$.

Since e_1 is also an Identity of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$, by Definition 2.6.1, $\forall t \in \mathbb{S}$, we have $e_1 \cdot t = t \cdot e_1 = t$.
Let $t = e$, then we have $e_1 \cdot e = e \cdot e_1 = e$.

Therefore we have that $e_1 \cdot e = e_1$ and $e_1 \cdot e = e$, implying $e_1 = e$.
And since $e_1 = e$, we can conclude that e is unique.

Proposition 2.6.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure with Unity, then $e \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

Proof: Since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ has unity e, by Definition 2.6.1, we know that $0 \cdot e = e \cdot 0 = 0$.
Therefore, by Definition 1.2.1, we can conclude $e \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

Proposition 2.6.3 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure with Unity, then $e \neq 0$.

Proof: Assume that $e = 0$ and let $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $x \neq 0$.
Then by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot x = 0$.
But $e = 0$, implying $e \cdot x = 0 \cdot x = 0$ and so $e \cdot x = 0$.

Now by Definition 2.6.1, since e is the Unity of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$, we know $e \cdot x = x$.
So we have $e \cdot x = 0$ and $e \cdot x = x$ implying $0 = x$.
However this is a contradiction because we know $x \neq 0$.
Therefore, we can conclude $e \neq 0$.

2.7 Commutative S-Structures With Scalar Inverses

And for the final piece of the puzzle, we will explore scalar inverse elements in S-Structures with a multiplication operation that has an identity element.

Definition 2.7.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure. We say $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an **S-Structure with Scalar Inverses** if $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ has Unity e and if $\forall x \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $x \neq 0$, there exists a multiplicative inverse $x^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that

$$x \cdot x^{-1} = x^{-1} \cdot x = e.$$

If $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$, we call it's multiplicative inverse x^{-1} a **Scalar Inverse**,

Proposition 2.7.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative S-Structure with Scalar Inverses, then e^{-1} exists and $e^{-1} = e$.

Proof: Since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Structure with Unity e, by Proposition 2.6.3, we know $e \neq 0$.
And by Proposition 2.6.2, we know $e \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Therefore, by Definition 2.7.1, this means $e^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ exists such that $e \cdot e^{-1} = e^{-1} \cdot e = e$.

But by Definition 2.6.1, since e is the Unity of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$, we know $e \cdot e^{-1} = e^{-1} \cdot e = e^{-1}$.
So we have $e \cdot e^{-1} = e^{-1} \cdot e = e$ and $e \cdot e^{-1} = e^{-1} \cdot e = e^{-1}$ implying $e = e^{-1}$.
Therefore we can conclude e^{-1} exists and $e^{-1} = e$.

3 Advanced Types Of S-Structures

At this point, we should be familiar with S-Structures and basic types of Commutative S-Structures. In keeping with our puzzle analogy, we finally have all of the pieces needed to put the puzzle together. We can finally build an S-Field, and build an S-Field we will do. However, we won't just put all of the pieces together all at once. We will do it in steps, putting a few pieces together at a time and then stepping back to see what they look like.

We will first create an Essential S-Structure by putting together a few of the basic types of Commutative S-Structures. This is where we begin to start cooking, as the saying goes. We will prove quite a few interesting properties about Essential S-Structures. We then move onto S-Rings by adding Unity to Essential S-Structures and prove some interesting properties about S-Rings. We will then add in Scalar Inverses to create S-Fields and prove some basic properties about them. After that, we will show an example of an S-Field to prove that these S-Structures really do exist. This then gives us all of the necessary algebraic properties needed to define Division By Scalars and Division By Zero.

3.1 Essential S-Structures

We begin by defining Essential S-Structures. As we will see, these particular S-Structures contain all of the essential algebraic properties needed for Division By Zero, lacking only the Unity and Scalar Inverses properties.

Definition 3.1.1 We define an **Essential S-Structure** as an S-Structure $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ that satisfies the following conditions:

1) $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Commutative.

2) $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive.

3) $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is S-Associative.

4) $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ has Standard Bases.

5) $0, 1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\mathbb{S}_0 = 1 \cdot \mathbb{S}_0$.

Here, we define $1 \cdot \mathbb{S}_0$ as

$$1 \cdot \mathbb{S}_0 = \{s \in \mathbb{S} \, : \, s = (1 \cdot x), \;\; x \in \mathbb{S}_0\}.$$

We can then list a few properties about Essential S-Structures that have already been proven in Section 2.

Proposition 3.1.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure, then

1) $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Coordinated.

2) $q_0(0) = 0$.

3) $A = q_0(1) + 1 \in \mathbb{S}_1$ exists and is unique.

4) $1 \cdot A = A \cdot 1 = A$.

5) $0 \cdot A = A \cdot 0 = 1$.

6) If $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $n = n - 1 + 0 \cdot A$.

7) If $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $s = \beta - 1 + \alpha \cdot A$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

8) If $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$ where $s = \beta_1 - 1 + \alpha_1 \cdot A$ and $t = \beta_2 - 1 + \alpha_2 \cdot A$, then $s = t$ if and only if $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$.

Proof: Now $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.

1) By Definition 3.1.1, we know that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive and $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Therefore, by Theorem 2.4.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Coordinated.

2) By part 1 of this proposition, we know that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Coordinated.
And by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ has Standard Bases and $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Therefore, by Proposition 2.3.10, we know $q_0(0) = 0$.

3) By part 1 of this proposition, we know that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Coordinated.
And by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ has Standard Bases and $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Therefore, by Proposition 2.3.4, we know $A = q_0(1) + 1 \in \mathbb{S}_1$ exists and is unique.

4) By part 1 of this proposition, we know that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Coordinated.
And by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Commutative and has Standard Bases.
So by Proposition 2.3.7, we know $1 \cdot A = A$.
And by Definition 1.1.4, we know $1 \cdot A = A \cdot 1$.
Therefore we have that $1 \cdot A = A \cdot 1 = A$.

5) By part 1 of this proposition, we know that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Coordinated.
And by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ has Standard Bases and $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Furthermore, Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Commutative.
So by Proposition 2.3.9, we have that $0 \cdot A = 1$.
And by Definition 1.1.4, we know $0 \cdot A = A \cdot 0$.
Therefore we have that $0 \cdot A = A \cdot 0 = 1$.

6) By part 1 of this proposition, we know that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Coordinated.
And by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ has Standard Bases and $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Therefore, by Proposition 2.3.11, we know if $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $n = n - 1 + 0 \cdot A$.

7) By part 1 of this proposition, we know that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Coordinated.
And by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ has Standard Bases.
Therefore, by Proposition 2.3.5, we know if $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $s = \beta - 1 + \alpha \cdot A$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

8) By part 1 of this proposition, we know that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Coordinated.
And by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ has Standard Bases and $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Therefore, by Proposition 2.3.6, we know if $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$ where $s = \beta_1 - 1 + \alpha_1 \cdot A$ and $t = \beta_2 - 1 + \alpha_2 \cdot A$, then $s = t$ if and only if $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$.

Next we will look at a few propositions regarding Essential S-Structures and Λ.

Proposition 3.1.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure, then $0, 1 \in \Lambda$.

Proof: Since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure, by Definition 3.1.1, Standard Bases exist.
And by Definition 2.3.1, we know $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_1$ exists, implying $\mathbb{S}_1 \neq \emptyset$.
Therefore, by Definition 1.2.2, we have that $1 \in \Lambda$.

Also by Definition 3.1.1, we know $0, 1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, implying $\mathbb{S}_0 \neq \emptyset$.
So by Definition 1.2.2, we know $0 \in \Lambda$.
Therefore, we have that $0, 1 \in \Lambda$.

Proposition 3.1.3 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure, then $(\Lambda, +)$ is closed.

Proof: Let $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$, then by Definition 1.2.2, we know $\mathbb{S}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathbb{S}_\beta \neq \emptyset$.
So $\exists s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ and $\exists t \in \mathbb{S}_\beta$ such that, by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot s = \alpha$ and $0 \cdot t = \beta$.

This implies that $(0 \cdot s) + (0 \cdot t) = \alpha + \beta$.

Now $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
So by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive and $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
And by Definition 2.4.1, this implies $(0 \cdot s) + (0 \cdot t) = 0 \cdot (s + t) + (0 \cdot 0)$.
However since $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot 0 = 0$.
Putting this all together, with the definition of identity, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} (0 \cdot s) + (0 \cdot t) &= 0 \cdot (s + t) + (0 \cdot 0) \\ &= 0 \cdot (s + t) + 0 \\ &= 0 \cdot (s + t). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $(0 \cdot s) + (0 \cdot t) = 0 \cdot (s + t)$ where $(0 \cdot s) + (0 \cdot t) = \alpha + \beta$.
So $0 \cdot (s + t) = \alpha + \beta$, and by Definition 1.2.1, this implies $s + t \in \mathbb{S}_{\alpha+\beta}$.
This means $\mathbb{S}_{\alpha+\beta} \neq \emptyset$ and by Definition 1.2.2, we have that $\alpha + \beta \in \Lambda$.
And so if $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$, then $\alpha + \beta \in \Lambda$ implying $(\Lambda, +)$ is closed.

Proposition 3.1.4 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure where $\alpha \in \Lambda$, then $-\alpha \in \Lambda$.

Proof: Let $\alpha \in \Lambda$, then by Definition 1.2.2, we know $\mathbb{S}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$.
This means $\exists s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ such that, by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot s = \alpha$.
Furthermore, since $s \in \mathbb{S}$, by Proposition 1.1.2, we know $-s \in \mathbb{S}$ is unique.
Putting this together, we see $0 \cdot s = \alpha$ implies $-(0 \cdot s) = -\alpha$.

However, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
So by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive and $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
And since $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Corollary 2.4.1, we know that $-(0 \cdot s) = 0 \cdot (-s)$.
This means that $-\alpha = -(0 \cdot s) = 0 \cdot (-s)$ and so $0 \cdot (-s) = -\alpha$.
But by Definition 1.2.1, this imples $-s \in \mathbb{S}_{-\alpha}$ and so $\mathbb{S}_{-\alpha} \neq \emptyset$.
Therefore, by Definition 1.2.2, we can conclude that $-\alpha \in \Lambda$.

Proposition 3.1.5 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure. If $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$, then

$$q_0(\alpha) + q_0(\beta) = q_0(\alpha + \beta).$$

Proof: We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
So by Proposition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Coordinated.
And by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive with Standard Bases.

Let $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$, then by Definition 1.2.2, we know $\mathbb{S}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathbb{S}_\beta \neq \emptyset$.
And by Definition 2.3.1, $q_0(\alpha) = \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1$ and $q_0(\beta) = \beta \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1$.
Furthermore, by Definition 2.3.2, we know $A = q_0(1) + 1$.
Therefore $q_0(\alpha) = \alpha \cdot (q_0(1)+1) - 1 = \alpha \cdot A - 1$ and $q_0(\beta) = \beta \cdot (q_0(1)+1) - 1 = \beta \cdot A - 1$.

So we have $q_0(\alpha) = \alpha \cdot A - 1$ and $q_0(\beta) = \beta \cdot A - 1$.
And by Proposition 3.1.1, we know $0 \cdot A = 1$.
Furthermore, by Definition 2.4.1, we know $\alpha \cdot A + \beta \cdot A = (\alpha + \beta) \cdot A + (0 \cdot A)$.
And by Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.
Putting this all together, we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_0(\alpha) + q_0(\beta) &= (\alpha \cdot A - 1) + (\beta \cdot A - 1) \\ &= \alpha \cdot A - 1 + \beta \cdot A - 1 \\ &= \alpha \cdot A + \beta \cdot A - 1 - 1 \\ &= (\alpha + \beta) \cdot A + (0 \cdot A) - 1 - 1 \\ &= (\alpha + \beta) \cdot A + (1) - 1 - 1 \\ &= (\alpha + \beta) \cdot A + 0 - 1 \\ &= (\alpha + \beta) \cdot A - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $q_0(\alpha) + q_0(\beta) = (\alpha + \beta) \cdot A - 1$ where $A = q_0(1) + 1$.
This means $q_0(\alpha) + q_0(\beta) = (\alpha + \beta) \cdot A - 1 = (\alpha + \beta) \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1$.

Now $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$ and by Proposition 3.1.3, we know $\alpha + \beta \in \Lambda$.
So by Definition 2.3.1, we know $q_0(\alpha + \beta) = (\alpha + \beta) \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1$.
But we showed $q_0(\alpha) + q_0(\beta) = (\alpha + \beta) \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1$.
Therefore, if $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$, then $q_0(\alpha) + q_0(\beta) = q_0(\alpha + \beta)$.

By Proposition 3.1.1, in an Essential S-Structure, we know that $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ and $t = u - 1 + v \cdot A$ for some $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$ and some $x, y, u, v \in \mathbb{S}_0$. The next three propositions will give us a unique formula for $s + t$, $-s$ and $s - t$ given that $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ and $t = u - 1 + v \cdot A$.

Proposition 3.1.6 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure. If $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$ where $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ and $t = u - 1 + v \cdot A$ for some $y, v \in \Lambda$ and $x, u \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $s + t$ has the unique formula

$$s + t = (x + u) - 1 + (y + v) \cdot A.$$

Proof: Since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure, by Definition 3.1.1, it is Wheel Distributive.
And by Proposition 3.1.1, we know $0 \cdot A = 1$.
Let $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$, then by Proposition 3.1.1, we know $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ and $t = u - 1 + v \cdot A$ for some $y, v \in \Lambda$ and $x, u \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

Since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive, by Definition 2.4.1, $y \cdot A + v \cdot A = (y + v) \cdot A + 0 \cdot A$.
By Definition 1.1.1, $(+, \cdot)$ are well defined, so $(x+u)-1+(y+v) \cdot A$ is a unique element.
And by Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.
Putting this all together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
s + t &= (x - 1 + y \cdot A) + (u - 1 + v \cdot A) \\
&= x - 1 + y \cdot A + u - 1 + v \cdot A \\
&= x + u - 1 - 1 + y \cdot A + v \cdot A \\
&= x + u - 1 - 1 + (y + v) \cdot A + 0 \cdot A \\
&= x + u - 1 - 1 + (y + v) \cdot A + 1 \\
&= x + u + 1 - 1 - 1 + (y + v) \cdot A \\
&= x + u + 0 - 1 + (y + v) \cdot A \\
&= x + u - 1 + (y + v) \cdot A \\
&= (x + u) - 1 + (y + v) \cdot A.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$ where $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ and $t = u - 1 + v \cdot A$ for some $y, v \in \Lambda$ and $x, u \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $s + t$ has the unique formula

$$s + t = (x + u) - 1 + (y + v) \cdot A.$$

Proposition 3.1.7 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure. If $s \in \mathbb{S}$ where $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ for some $y \in \Lambda$ and $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $-s$ has the unique formula

$$-s = -x - 1 + (-y) \cdot A.$$

Proof: Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then by Proposition 3.1.1, $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ for some $y \in \Lambda$ and $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
By Definition 1.1.1, we know $-s \in \mathbb{S}$ exists and by Proposition 1.1.2, that $-s$ is unique.
And so $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ implies $-s = -(x - 1 + y \cdot A)$.

Now, by Definition 1.1.2 of Subtraction, we know that $x - 1 = x + (-1)$.
And by Proposition 1.1.2, we know that $-(x + (-1) + y \cdot A) = -x + -(-1) + (-y \cdot A)$.
By Proposition 1.1.2, we also know that $-(-1) = 1$.
Putting all of this together, we see

$$\begin{aligned}
-s &= -(x - 1 + y \cdot A) \\
&= -(x + (-1) + y \cdot A) \\
&= -x + -(-1) + -(y \cdot A) \\
&= -x + 1 + -(y \cdot A).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $-s = -x + 1 + -(y \cdot A)$.
Since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure, by Definition 3.1.1, it is Wheel Distributive.
And by Proposition 2.4.1, we know $-(y \cdot A) = (-y) \cdot A - 0 \cdot A - 0 \cdot A$.
Furthermore, by Proposition 3.1.1, we know $0 \cdot A = 1$ and so we have

$$\begin{aligned} -(y \cdot A) &= (-y) \cdot A - 0 \cdot A - 0 \cdot A \\ &= (-y) \cdot A - 1 - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $-(y \cdot A) = (-y) \cdot A - 1 - 1$.
However $-s = -x + 1 + -(y \cdot A)$ and by Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$, implying

$$\begin{aligned} -s &= -x + 1 + -(y \cdot A) \\ &= -x + 1 + [(-y) \cdot A - 1 - 1] \\ &= -x + 1 + (-y) \cdot A - 1 - 1 \\ &= -x + 1 - 1 - 1 + (-y) \cdot A \\ &= -x + 0 - 1 + (-y) \cdot A \\ &= -x - 1 + (-y) \cdot A. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $-s$ has the unique formula

$$-s = -x - 1 + (-y) \cdot A.$$

Proposition 3.1.8 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure. If $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$ where $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ and $t = u - 1 + v \cdot A$ for some $x, y \in \Lambda$ and $u, v \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $s - t$ has the unique formula

$$s - t = (x - u) - 1 + (y - v) \cdot A.$$

Proof: We know that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
Let $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$, then by Proposition 3.1.1, we know $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ and $t = u - 1 + v \cdot A$ for some $y, v \in \Lambda$ and $x, u \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

By Proposition 3.1.7, we know $-t = -u - 1 + (-v) \cdot A$.
And by Proposition 3.1.6, we have $s + (-t) = (x + (-u)) - 1 + (y + (-v)) \cdot A$.
By Proposition 3.1.6, we also know $(x + (-u)) - 1 + (y + (-v)) \cdot A$ is a unique element.
Furthermore, by Definition 1.1.2 of Subtraction, $x + (-u) = x - u$ and $y + (-v) = y - v$.
We also know, by Definition 1.1.2, that $s - t = s + (-t)$.

Putting all of this together, we can conclude

$$\begin{aligned} s - t &= s + (-t) \\ &= (x + (-u)) - 1 + (y + (-v)) \cdot A \\ &= (x - u) - 1 + (y - v) \cdot A. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$ where $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ and $t = u - 1 + v \cdot A$ for some $y, v \in \Lambda$ and $x, u \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $s - t$ has the unique formula

$$s - t = (x - u) - 1 + (y - v) \cdot A.$$

Next we will explore the Set of Scalars, $\mathbb{S}_0$, with the addition and multiplication operations in an Essential S-Structure $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$. Our goal is to show that $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ forms a Commutative Ring with Unity 1 and show the implications this has for $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ as a whole.

Proposition 3.1.9 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure, then $(\mathbb{S}_0, +)$ is closed.

Proof: Let $x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot x = 0$ and $0 \cdot y = 0$.
This means $(0 \cdot x) + (0 \cdot y) = 0 + 0 = 0$, implying $(0 \cdot x) + (0 \cdot y) = 0$.

Now, we know that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
So by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive and $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
And by Definition 2.4.1, we know $(0 \cdot x) + (0 \cdot y) = 0 \cdot (x + y) + (0 \cdot 0)$.
However since $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot 0 = 0$.
Putting this all together, with the definition of identity, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}(0 \cdot x) + (0 \cdot y) &= 0 \cdot (x + y) + (0 \cdot 0) \\ &= 0 \cdot (x + y) + 0 \\ &= 0 \cdot (x + y).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $(0 \cdot x) + (0 \cdot y) = 0 \cdot (x + y)$ where $(0 \cdot x) + (0 \cdot y) = 0$.
Thus $0 \cdot (x + y) = 0$, and by Definition 1.2.1, this implies $x + y \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
This means that if $x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $x + y \in \mathbb{S}_0$ implying $(\mathbb{S}_0, +)$ is closed.

Proposition 3.1.10 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure where $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $-x \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

Proof: Let $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot x = 0$.
And by Proposition 1.1.2, we know if $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $-s$ is unique.
This means that $0 \cdot x = 0$ implies $-(0 \cdot x) = -0$.
Furthermore, by Proposition 1.1.2, we know $-0 = 0$.

We also know that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
So by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive.
And by Corollary 2.4.1 , since $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$, this means that $-(0 \cdot x) = 0 \cdot (-x)$.
Therefore $-(0 \cdot x) = -0$ implies $0 \cdot (-x) = 0$.
And so by Definition 1.2.1, this implies $-x \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

Proposition 3.1.11 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure, then $(\mathbb{S}_0, -)$ is closed.

Proof: Let $x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then by Definition 1.1.2, we know $x - y = x + (-y)$.
And by Proposition 3.1.10, since $y \in \mathbb{S}_0$, we know $-y \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Furthermore, by Proposition 3.1.9, we know $(\mathbb{S}_0, +)$ is closed.

Now we have $x, -y \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and so we can conclude that implying $x - y = x + (-y) \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Therefore, if $x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $x - y \in \mathbb{S}_0$ implying $(\mathbb{S}, -)$ is closed.

Proposition 3.1.12 If $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure, then $(\mathbb{S}_0, \cdot)$ is closed.

Proof: Let $m, n \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Now, we know that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
So by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Commutative and S-Associative with $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
And since $m, 0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Proposition 2.5.2, we know $0 \cdot (m \cdot n) = m \cdot (0 \cdot n)$.
But $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and so by Definition 1.2.1, this means that $0 \cdot n = 0$.
Therefore $0 \cdot (m \cdot n) = m \cdot (0 \cdot n) = m \cdot 0$.

But by Definition 1.2.1, we also know that $m \cdot 0 = 0$.
This means $0 \cdot (m \cdot n) = m \cdot 0 = 0$.
Therefore $0 \cdot (m \cdot n) = 0$ and by Definition 1.2.1, this implies $m \cdot n \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
So we can conclude that if $m, n \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $m \cdot n \in \mathbb{S}_0$ implying $(\mathbb{S}_0, \cdot)$ is closed.

Proposition 3.1.13 If $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure, then $(\mathbb{S}_0, \cdot)$ is Associative.

Proof: Let $m, n, p \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
So by Definition 3.1.1, we know that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is S-Associative and Commutative.

And by Definition 2.5.1, $m \cdot (n \cdot p) = (m \cdot n) \cdot p - ([(m-1) \cdot (n-1)] \cdot (0 \cdot p))$.
But $p \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and so by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot p = 0$.
This means that

$$\begin{aligned} m \cdot (n \cdot p) &= (m \cdot n) \cdot p - ([(m-1) \cdot (n-1)] \cdot (0 \cdot p)) \\ &= (m \cdot n) \cdot p - ([(m-1) \cdot (n-1)] \cdot (0)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $m \cdot (n \cdot p) = (m \cdot n) \cdot p - ([(m-1) \cdot (n-1)] \cdot (0))$.
However, since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Commutative, by Definition 1.1.4, we know

$$[(m-1) \cdot (n-1)] \cdot (0) = (0) \cdot [(m-1) \cdot (n-1)].$$

But $m, n, 1, 0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and so by Proposition 3.1.11, we know $(m-1) \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $(n-1) \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
This means that $0, (m-1), (n-1) \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is S-Associative and Commutative.
So by Proposition 2.5.2, this means $(0) \cdot [(m-1) \cdot (n-1)] = (m-1) \cdot [0 \cdot (n-1)]$.
And since $(n-1) \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot (n-1) = 0$.
This means that

$$\begin{aligned} [(m-1) \cdot (n-1)] \cdot (0) &= (0) \cdot [(m-1) \cdot (n-1)] \\ &= (m-1) \cdot [0 \cdot (n-1)] \\ &= (m-1) \cdot [0]. \end{aligned}$$

Again, since $(m-1) \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Definition 1.2.1, we know $(m-1) \cdot 0 = 0$.
This means that

$$\begin{aligned} [(m-1) \cdot (n-1)] \cdot (0) &= (m-1) \cdot [0] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $[(m-1) \cdot (n-1)] \cdot (0) = 0$.

So we know that $m \cdot (n \cdot p) = (m \cdot n) \cdot p - ([(m-1) \cdot (n-1)] \cdot (0))$.
We also know that $[(m-1) \cdot (n-1)] \cdot (0) = 0$.
Furthermore, by Proposition 1.1.3, we know that $(m \cdot n) \cdot p - 0 = (m \cdot n) \cdot p$.
Putting all of this together, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} m \cdot (n \cdot p) &= (m \cdot n) \cdot p - ([(m-1) \cdot (n-1)] \cdot (0)) \\ &= (m \cdot n) \cdot p - (0) \\ &= (m \cdot n) \cdot p. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $m \cdot (n \cdot p) = (m \cdot n) \cdot p$ implying $(\mathbb{S}_0, \cdot)$ is Associative.

Proposition 3.1.14 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure, then $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ is Distributive.

Proof: We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
So by Definition 3.1.1, we know that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive and Commutative.

Let $x, y, z \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then by Definition 1.2.1, we know $x \cdot 0 = 0$.
Furthermore, since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive, by Definition 2.4.1, we know

$$x \cdot (y + z) + (x \cdot 0) = (x \cdot y) + (x \cdot z).$$

But $x \cdot 0 = 0$ where 0 is the identitiy for $(\mathbb{S}, +)$.
This means that

$$\begin{aligned} (x \cdot y) + (x \cdot z) &= x \cdot (y + z) + (x \cdot 0) \\ &= x \cdot (y + z) + 0 \\ &= x \cdot (y + z). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $x \cdot (y + z) = (x \cdot y) + (x \cdot z)$ implying $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ is Left Distributive.
But by Definition 1.1.4, we know $x \cdot (y + z) = (y + z) \cdot x$.
And by the same definition, we also know that $(x \cdot y) + (x \cdot z) = (y \cdot x) + (z \cdot x)$.
Putting these together, we see $x \cdot (y+z) = (x \cdot y)+(x \cdot z)$ implies $(y+z) \cdot x = (y \cdot x)+(z \cdot x)$,
This means that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Right Distributive.

So we have shown that $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ is Left Distributive and Right Distributive.
Therefore, we can conclude that $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ is Distributive.

Proposition 3.1.15 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure, then $1 \cdot 1 = 1$.

Proof: We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
So by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is S-Associative, has Standard Bases and $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ has Standard Bases, by Definition 2.3.1, we know $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_1$ exists.
And since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is S-Associative, by Definition 2.5.1, we know

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \cdot (1 \cdot q_0(1)) &= (0 \cdot 1) \cdot q_0(1) - [(0 - 1) \cdot (1 - 1)] \cdot (0 \cdot q_0(1)) \\ &= (0 \cdot 1) \cdot q_0(1) - [(-1) \cdot (0)] \cdot (0 \cdot q_0(1)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_1$ and $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot q_0(1) = 1$ and $0 \cdot 1 = 0$.
And since $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Proposition 3.1.10, we also know $-1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ implying $-1 \cdot 0 = 0$.
Furthermore, by Proposition 1.1.3, we know that $1 - 0 = 1$
Putting this all together, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \cdot (1 \cdot q_0(1)) &= (0 \cdot 1) \cdot q_0(1) - [(-1) \cdot (0)] \cdot (0 \cdot q_0(1)) \\ &= (0) \cdot q_0(1) - [0] \cdot (1) \\ &= 1 - 0 \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have $0 \cdot (1 \cdot q_0(1)) = 1$.
Now $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is S-Associative, but by Definition 3.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is also Commutative.
So by Proposition 2.5.3, since $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_1$, we can conclude $1 \cdot q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_{1 \cdot 1}$.
And again, by Definition 1.2.1, this means $0 \cdot (1 \cdot q_0(1)) = 1 \cdot 1$.
Therefore $0 \cdot (1 \cdot q_0(1)) = 1$ and $0 \cdot (1 \cdot q_0(1)) = 1 \cdot 1$, implying $1 \cdot 1 = 1$.

Proposition 3.1.16 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure. If $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $1 \cdot (1 \cdot x) = 1 \cdot x$.

Proof: Now $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
So by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is S-Associative and Commutative with $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
This means, by Proposition 3.1.13, that $(\mathbb{S}_0, \cdot)$ is Associative.

If we let $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$, since $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $(\mathbb{S}_0, \cdot)$ is Associative, we know $1 \cdot (1 \cdot x) = (1 \cdot 1) \cdot x$.
But by Proposition 3.1.15, we know $1 \cdot 1 = 1$.
Therefore, we can conclude $1 \cdot (1 \cdot x) = (1 \cdot 1) \cdot x = 1 \cdot x$.
So if $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $1 \cdot (1 \cdot x) = 1 \cdot x$.

Proposition 3.1.17 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure. If $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $1 \cdot x = x \cdot 1 = x$.

Proof: By Definition 3.1.1, we know that $\mathbb{S}_0 = 1 \cdot \mathbb{S}_0$ where

$$1 \cdot \mathbb{S}_0 = \{s \in \mathbb{S} \,:\, s = (1 \cdot x), \ \ \forall x \in \mathbb{S}_0\}.$$

Let $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then we know that $x \in 1 \cdot \mathbb{S}_0$.
So we can write $x = 1 \cdot y$ for some $y \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

But by Definition 1.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is well defined.
And since $x = 1 \cdot y$, we know that $1 \cdot x = 1 \cdot (1 \cdot y)$.

By Proposition 3.1.16, we know $1 \cdot (1 \cdot y) = 1 \cdot y$.
Putting this all together, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \cdot x &= 1 \cdot (1 \cdot y) \\ &= 1 \cdot y \\ &= x. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have that $1 \cdot x = x$.
And since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Commutative, by Definition 1.1.4, we know $1 \cdot x = x \cdot 1$.
So if $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then we can conclude that $1 \cdot x = x \cdot 1 = x$.

Theorem 3.1.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure, then $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ forms a Commutative Ring with Unity 1.

Proof: By Proposition 3.1.9, we know $(\mathbb{S}_0, +)$ is closed.
And since $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is Associative by Definition 1.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}_0, +)$ is Associative.
By Definition 3.1.1, we know that $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where 0 is the identity for $(\mathbb{S}, +)$.
By Proposition 3.1.10, we know that $\forall x \in \mathbb{S}_0$, there exists $-x \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
And since $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is Commutative by Definition 1.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}_0, +)$ is Commutative.
Therefore, we see that $(\mathbb{S}_0, +)$ forms a Commutative Group.

Furthermore, by Proposition 3.1.12, we know $(\mathbb{S}_0, \cdot)$ is closed.
By Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is Commutative implying $(\mathbb{S}_0, \cdot)$ is Commutative.
By Proposition 3.1.13, we know that $(\mathbb{S}_0, \cdot)$ is Associative.
By Proposition 3.1.14, we know that $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ is Distributive.
By Proposition 3.1.17, $\forall x \in \mathbb{S}_0$, we know that $1 \cdot x = x \cdot 1 = x$.
And by Definition 3.1.1, we know $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, implying that 1 is the identity for $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$.

All of these together imply that $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ forms a Commutative Ring with Unity 1.

Theorem 3.1.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure, then it is an S-Extension of $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$.

Proof: Define the set $F_{\mathbb{S}}$ as $F_{\mathbb{S}} = \mathbb{S}_0$.
Also define the function $\phi : (F_{\mathbb{S}}, +, \cdot) \mapsto (\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot) = \phi : (\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot) \mapsto (\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$.
$x \mapsto x \qquad\qquad x \mapsto x$
Then we have that:
1) If $x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $\phi(x) = \phi(y)$, then $\phi(x) = x$ and $\phi(y) = y$, implying $x = y$.
Therefore, if $\phi(x) = \phi(y)$, then $x = y$ implying ϕ is one-to-one.

2) If $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $\phi(x) = x$ and so if $y = x$, we know $\phi(y) = \phi(x) = x$.
Therefore, if $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$ then $\exists y \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $\phi(y) = x$ implying ϕ is onto.

Putting these together, we see that ϕ is a bijection.

Furthermore, if $x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $\phi(x + y) = x + y = \phi(x) + \phi(y)$.
We also have that $\phi(x \cdot y) = x \cdot y = \phi(x) \cdot \phi(y)$.
Therefore ϕ is a homomorphism.
And since ϕ is also a bijection, we have that ϕ is an isomorphism.

So we have that $\mathbb{S}_0 = F_{\mathbb{S}} \subset \mathbb{S}$ where $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Structure.
We also know $\phi : (\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot) \mapsto (\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot) = \phi : (F_{\mathbb{S}}, +, \cdot) \mapsto (\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ is an isomorphism.
Furthermore, by Proposition 3.1.9 and Proposition 3.1.12, $(\mathbb{S}_0, +)$ and $(\mathbb{S}_0, \cdot)$ are closed.
Therefore, by Definition 1.1.3, we can conclude $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Extension of $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$.

Corollary 3.1.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure, then $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Extension of a Commutative Ring with Unity 1.

Proof: By Theorem 3.1.1 above, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Extension of $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$.
And by Theorem 3.1.2 above, $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ is a Commutative Ring with Unity 1.

Therefore $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Extension of a Commutative Ring with Unity 1.

So we know that all Essential S-Structures are S-Extensions of $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$, which are Commutative Rings with Unity 1. This is very important and is the beginning of proving that all S-Fields are extensions of Fields. Our next two propositions will be used later when we begin to explore S-Rings.

Proposition 3.1.18 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure. If $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $n \cdot q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_n$.

Proof: We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
So by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Commutative and S-Associative.
By Definition 3.1.1, we also know that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ has Standard Bases.

This means that by Definition 2.3.1, we know $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_1$ exists.
Let $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then by Proposition 2.5.3, we know $n \cdot q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_{n \cdot 1}$.
Furthermore, by Proposition 3.1.17, we know $n \cdot 1 = n$.
So $n \cdot q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_{n \cdot 1}$ where $n \cdot 1 = n$, implying $n \cdot q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_n$.
Therefore, if $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $n \cdot q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_n$.

Proposition 3.1.19 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure, then $\mathbb{S}_0 \subseteq \Lambda$.

Proof: We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
So by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Commutative and has Standard Bases.
Furthermore, by Definition 2.3.1, we know $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_1$ exists.

Let $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then by Proposition 3.1.18, we know $n \cdot q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_n$ implying $\mathbb{S}_n \neq \emptyset$.
And since $\mathbb{S}_n \neq \emptyset$, by Definition 1.2.2, we know that $n \in \Lambda$.
Therefore, if $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $n \in \Lambda$ implying $\mathbb{S}_0 \subseteq \Lambda$.

This leaves only two propositions left to prove before we can move on to S-Rings. The first proposition will be used when we show that $0 \neq 1$ and the second will be used when we show that 1 is the Unity of an S-Ring.

Proposition 3.1.20 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure. If $0 = 1$, then $\mathbb{S}_0 = \{0\}$.

Proof: Let $0 = 1$ and assume $\mathbb{S}_0 \neq \{0\}$, then $\exists x \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $x \neq 0$.
By Definition 1.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is well defined.
Therefore, since $0 = 1$, we know $0 \cdot x = 1 \cdot x$.

But by Proposition 3.1.17, we know $1 \cdot x = x$.
And since $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot x = 0$.
Putting these together, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} x &= 1 \cdot x \\ &= 0 \cdot x \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $x = 0$, which is a contradiction because we know that $x \neq 0$.
So we can conclude that $\nexists x \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $x \neq 0$, implying $\mathbb{S}_0 = \{0\}$.
Therefore if $0 = 1$, then $\mathbb{S}_0 = \{0\}$.

Proposition 3.1.21 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure. If $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $n \cdot A = 1$, then $n = 0$.

Proof: We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
So by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ has Standard Bases and $0, 1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
And by Definition 2.3.2, we know $A = q_0(1) + 1$.

Now let $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $n \cdot A = 1$, then by Proposition 3.1.19, we know $n \in \Lambda$.
By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.
These imply that

$$\begin{aligned} n \cdot A &= 1 \\ -1 + n \cdot A &= -1 + 1 \\ -1 + n \cdot A &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $-1 + n \cdot A = 0$ where $n \in \Lambda$.
By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ forms a Commutative Group with inverses $-s$ for all $s \in \mathbb{S}$.
So we can conclude $0 = -1 + 1$.
But by Proposition 3.1.1, we know $1 = 0 \cdot A$ implying

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= -1 + 1 \\ &= -1 + 0 \cdot A. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have $0 = -1 + 0 \cdot A$ where $-1 + n \cdot A = 0$.
And by Proposition 3.1.2, we know $0 \in \Lambda$.
So $-1 + n \cdot A = -1 + 0 \cdot A$ where $0, n \in \Lambda$ and $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

And since 0 is the identity of $(\mathbb{S}, +)$, we can write this as

$$0 - 1 + n \cdot A = 0 - 1 + 0 \cdot A.$$

So by Proposition 3.1.1, we can conclude $0 = 0$ and $n = 0$.
Therefore, if $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $n \cdot A = 1$, then $n = 0$.

3.2 S-Rings

At this point, we are familiar with Essential S-Structures and most of their properties. We are now ready to explore S-Rings. We will define S-Rings by adding Unity to Essential S-Structures. We will then prove that $e = 1$ is the unique Unity of an S-Ring and see how this affects the S-Structure as a whole. When we are finished, we will finally be ready to define S-Fields.

Definition 3.2.1 We say an S-Structure $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is a **Santangelo Ring** (or **S-Ring**) if $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ forms an Essential S-Structure with Unity.

Proposition 3.2.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Ring, then $e = 1$ is the unique Unity of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$.

Proof: We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring.
So by Definition 3.2.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure with Unity, call it e.
And by Proposition 3.1.1, we know A exists and $1 \cdot A = A$.
However $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ has Unity e and by Definition 2.6.1, this means $e \cdot A = A$.
Therefore $1 \cdot A = A = e \cdot A$, implying $1 \cdot A = e \cdot A$.

And by Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ forms a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$, implying

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \cdot A &= e \cdot A \\ 1 \cdot A + [-(e \cdot A)] &= e \cdot A + [-(e \cdot A)] \\ 1 \cdot A + [-(e \cdot A)] &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have that $1 \cdot A + [-(e \cdot A)] = 0$.
Since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure, by Definition 3.1.1, it is Wheel Distributive.

But by Proposition 2.4.1, we know $-(e \cdot A) = (-e) \cdot A - (0 \cdot A) - (0 \cdot A)$.
This implies $1 \cdot A + [-(e \cdot A)] = 1 \cdot A + [(-e) \cdot A - (0 \cdot A) - (0 \cdot A)]$.

Now by Proposition 3.1.1, we know $0 \cdot A = 1$ and since $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \cdot A + [-(e \cdot A)] &= 1 \cdot A + [(-e) \cdot A - (0 \cdot A) - (0 \cdot A)] \\ &= 1 \cdot A + [(-e) \cdot A - (1) - (1)] \\ &= [1 \cdot A + (-e) \cdot A] - 1 - 1. \end{aligned}$$

But since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive, by Definition 2.4.1, this implies

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \cdot A + [-(e \cdot A)] &= [1 \cdot A + (-e) \cdot A] - 1 - 1 \\ &= [(1 + (-e)) \cdot A + (0 \cdot A)] - 1 - 1 \\ &= [(1 + (-e)) \cdot A + 1] - 1 - 1 \\ &= (1 + (-e)) \cdot A + [1 - 1 - 1] \\ &= (1 + (-e)) \cdot A + [0 - 1] \\ &= (1 + (-e)) \cdot A + [-1]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $1 \cdot A + [-(e \cdot A)] = (1 + (-e)) \cdot A + [-1]$.
However, we showed earlier that $1 \cdot A + [-(e \cdot A)] = 0$ implying $(1 + (-e)) \cdot A + [-1] = 0$.
Again, since $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ forms a Commutative Group with identity 0, this implies

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + (-e)) \cdot A + [-1] &= 0 \\ ((1 + (-e)) \cdot A + [-1]) + 1 &= 0 + 1 \\ (1 + (-e)) \cdot A + ([-1] + 1) &= 1 \\ (1 + (-e)) \cdot A + 0 &= 1 \\ (1 + (-e)) \cdot A &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get that $(1 + (-e)) \cdot A = 1$.

Again, since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure, by Definition 3.1.1, we know $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Furthermore, by Proposition 2.6.2, we know that $e \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
And by Proposition 3.1.10, this means that $-e \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
So by Proposition 3.1.9, since $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $-e \in \mathbb{S}_0$, we have that $(1 + (-e)) \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

If we let $(1 + (-e)) = n$, then $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $(1 + (-e)) \cdot A = n \cdot A = 1$.
This means that $n \cdot A = 1$ where $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
However, by Proposition 3.1.21, this implies that $n = 0$.
Therefore $n = (1 + (-e)) = 0$ implying $(1 + (-e)) = 0$.

Again, since $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ forms a Commutative Group with identity 0, this implies

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + (-e)) &= 0 \\ (1 + (-e)) + e &= 0 + e \\ 1 + ((-e) + e) &= e \\ 1 + 0 &= e \\ 1 &= e. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can conclude that $e = 1$ is the unique Unity of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$.

Corollary 3.2.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Ring, then $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Extension of a Commutative Ring with Unity 1 where $e = 1$ is the unique Unity of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$.

Proof: We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field.
By Definition 3.2.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure with Unity e.
Then by Proposition 3.2.1, we know $e = 1$.

Therefore, by Corollary 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Extension of a Commutative Ring with Unity 1 where $e = 1$ is the unique Unity of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$.

So we see that $e = 1$ is the unique Unity of an S-Ring and that all S-Rings are S-Extensions of $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$, which are Commutative Rings with Unity $e = 1$. Next, we will show that all S-Rings are Complete Regular.

Proposition 3.2.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Ring, then $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{S}_0$.

Proof: We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field.
So by Definition 3.2.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure with Unity.
And by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is S-Associative and $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

Let $\alpha \in \Lambda$, then by Definition 1.2.2, we know $\mathbb{S}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$
Let $s \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$, then by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot s = \alpha$.
Since $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Definition 1.2.1, we know $1 \cdot 0 = 0$.
And since $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Proposition 3.1.10, we know $-1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ implying $0 \cdot -1 = 0$.
And by Proposition 3.2.1 and Definition 2.6.1, $e = 1$ such that $e \cdot s = 1 \cdot s = s$.
Furthermore since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is S-Associative, by Definition 2.5.1, we know

$$0 \cdot (1 \cdot s) = (1 \cdot 0) \cdot s - [(1 - 1) \cdot (0 - 1)] \cdot (0 \cdot s).$$

Putting this all together, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= 0 \cdot s \\ &= 0 \cdot (1 \cdot s) \\ &= (1 \cdot 0) \cdot s - [(1 - 1) \cdot (0 - 1)] \cdot (0 \cdot s) \\ &= 0 \cdot s - [0 \cdot (-1)] \cdot (0 \cdot s) \\ &= 0 \cdot s - [0] \cdot (0 \cdot s) \\ &= \alpha - 0 \cdot \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\alpha = \alpha - 0 \cdot \alpha$.
And by Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.
Putting this all together, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \alpha - 0 \cdot \alpha \\ \alpha + 0 \cdot \alpha &= (\alpha - 0 \cdot \alpha) + 0 \cdot \alpha \\ \alpha + 0 \cdot \alpha &= \alpha + (-0 \cdot \alpha + 0 \cdot \alpha) \\ \alpha + 0 \cdot \alpha &= \alpha + (0) \\ \alpha + 0 \cdot \alpha &= \alpha \\ -\alpha + (\alpha + 0 \cdot \alpha) &= -\alpha + \alpha \\ (-\alpha + \alpha) + 0 \cdot \alpha &= 0 \\ (0) + 0 \cdot \alpha &= 0 \\ 0 \cdot \alpha &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $0 \cdot \alpha = 0$ implying, by Definition 1.2.1, that $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
So we can conclude that if $\alpha \in \Lambda$, then $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ implying $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{S}_0$.

Theorem 3.2.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Ring, then $\Lambda = \mathbb{S}_0$ implying $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Complete Regular.

Proof: By Definition 3.2.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure with Unity.
Therefore by Proposition 3.2.2, we know $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{S}_0$.
And by Proposition 3.1.19, we know that $\mathbb{S}_0 \subseteq \Lambda$.

This implies that $\Lambda = \mathbb{S}_0$.

Therefore, by Proposition 2.1.2, $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Complete Regular.

As promised, we see that all S-Rings are Complete Regular. Next, if $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $s \in \mathbb{S}$, we will develop a unique formula for $m \cdot s$.

Proposition 3.2.3 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Ring. If $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ for some $x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $s \in \mathbb{S}_y$.

Proof: Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$.
By Definition 3.2.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
So by Proposition 3.1.1, we know $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A \in \mathbb{S}_y$ for some $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $y \in \Lambda$.

However, by Theorem 3.2.1, we know $\Lambda = \mathbb{S}_0$ and since $y \in \Lambda$, we know $y \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Therefore if $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ for some $x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $s \in \mathbb{S}_y$.

Proposition 3.2.4 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Ring where $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ for some $x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and we have the following unique formula:

$$m \cdot s = m \cdot (x - y) + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A.$$

Proof: Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$ and $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Then by Proposition 3.2.3, we know $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ for some $x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
And since $m, x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Definition 1.2.1, we know $m \cdot 0 = 0$, $0 \cdot y = 0$ and $0 \cdot x = 0$.

Now, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring.
So by Definition 3.2.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
And by Definition 3.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive, S-Associative and $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
By Definition 2.4.1, this means $m \cdot ((x - 1) + (y \cdot A)) = m \cdot (x - 1) + m \cdot (y \cdot A) - m \cdot 0$.

By Proposition 1.1.3, $\forall s \in \mathbb{S}$, we know that $s - 0 = s$.
Putting this all together, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m \cdot s &= m \cdot ((x - 1) + (y \cdot A)) \\ &= m \cdot (x - 1) + m \cdot (y \cdot A) - m \cdot 0 \\ &= m \cdot (x - 1) + m \cdot (y \cdot A) - 0 \\ &= m \cdot (x - 1) + m \cdot (y \cdot A). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $m \cdot s = m \cdot (x - 1) + m \cdot (y \cdot A)$.
But $m, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is S-Associative, so by Definition 2.5.1, we know

$$m \cdot (y \cdot A) = (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [(m - 1) \cdot (y - 1)] \cdot (0 \cdot A).$$

And by Proposition 3.1.1, we know $0 \cdot A = 1$.
Furthermore, by Proposition 3.2.1, we know $1 = e$ is the Unity of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$.
So by Definition 2.6.1, we know $[(m - 1) \cdot (y - 1)] \cdot 1 = [(m - 1) \cdot (y - 1)]$.
Putting this all together, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m \cdot (y \cdot A) &= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [(m - 1) \cdot (y - 1)] \cdot (0 \cdot A) \\ &= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [(m - 1) \cdot (y - 1)] \cdot 1 \\ &= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [(m - 1) \cdot (y - 1)]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $m \cdot (y \cdot A) = (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [(m - 1) \cdot (y - 1)]$.

However $1, m, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
So by Proposition 3.1.11, we know $(\mathbb{S}_0, -)$ is closed, implying $(m - 1), (y - 1) \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
By Definition 1.2.1, this means that $0 \cdot (m - 1) = 0$.

And since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive and $-1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Corollary 2.4.2, $(-1)\cdot(-1) = 1$.

By Definition 1.1.2 of Subtraction, $\forall s, t \in \mathbb{S}$, we know that $s - t = s + (-t)$
Again, by Proposition 1.1.3, $\forall s \in \mathbb{S}$, we know that $s - 0 = s$.
And $\forall s, t, r \in \mathbb{S}$, by Definition 2.4.1, we know that

$$(s + t) \cdot r = s \cdot r + t \cdot r - 0 \cdot r.$$

Putting this all together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
m \cdot (y \cdot A) &= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [(m - 1) \cdot (y - 1)] \\
&= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [(m - 1) \cdot (y + (-1))] \\
&= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [(m - 1) \cdot y + (m - 1) \cdot (-1) - [0 \cdot (m - 1)]] \\
&= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [(m - 1) \cdot y + (m - 1) \cdot (-1) - [0]] \\
&= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [(m + (-1)) \cdot y + (m + (-1)) \cdot (-1)] \\
&= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [(m + (-1)) \cdot y + m \cdot (-1) + (-1) \cdot (-1) - [0 \cdot (-1)]] \\
&= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [(m + (-1)) \cdot y + m \cdot (-1) + 1 - [0]] \\
&= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [(m + (-1)) \cdot y + m \cdot (-1) + 1] \\
&= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [m \cdot y + (-1) \cdot y - [0 \cdot y] + m \cdot (-1) + 1] \\
&= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [m \cdot y + (-1) \cdot y - [0] + m \cdot (-1) + 1] \\
&= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [m \cdot y + (-1) \cdot y + m \cdot (-1) + 1].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $m \cdot (y \cdot A) = (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [m \cdot y + (-1) \cdot y + m \cdot (-1) + 1]$.

By Corollary 2.4.1, since $1, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$, we know $(-1) \cdot y = -(1 \cdot y)$ and $m \cdot (-1) = -(m \cdot 1)$.
And since $e = 1$ is the Unity of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$, we know $-(1 \cdot y) = -y$ and $-(m \cdot 1) = -m$.
This means that $(-1) \cdot y = -y$ and $m \cdot (-1) = -m$.
This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
m \cdot (y \cdot A) &= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [m \cdot y + (-1) \cdot y + m \cdot (-1) + 1] \\
&= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [m \cdot y + (-y) + (-m) + 1].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $m \cdot (y \cdot A) = (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [m \cdot y + (-y) + (-m) + 1]$.

By Proposition 1.1.2, $-[m \cdot y + (-y) + (-m) + 1] = -(m \cdot y) + -(-y) + -(-m) + (-1)$.
And by Proposition 1.1.2, we also know $-(-y) = y$ and $-(-m) = m$.
Putting this together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
m \cdot (y \cdot A) &= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - [m \cdot y + (-y) + (-m) + 1] \\
&= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - (m \cdot y) + -(-y) + -(-m) + (-1) \\
&= (m \cdot y) \cdot A - (m \cdot y) + y + m - 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $m \cdot (y \cdot A) = (m \cdot y) \cdot A - (m \cdot y) + y + m - 1$.

But we showed earlier that $m \cdot s = m \cdot (x - 1) + m \cdot (y \cdot A)$.
By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.
Again, by Proposition 1.1.3, $\forall s \in \mathbb{S}$, we know that $s - 0 = s$.
And again, by Definition 2.4.1, we know that

$$(s + t) \cdot r = s \cdot r + t \cdot r - 0 \cdot r.$$

Putting this all together, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m \cdot s &= m \cdot (x-1) + m \cdot (y \cdot A) \\ &= m \cdot (x-1) + (m \cdot y) \cdot A - (m \cdot y) + y + m - 1 \\ &= m \cdot (x + (-1)) + (m \cdot y) \cdot A - (m \cdot y) + y + m - 1 \\ &= m \cdot x + m \cdot (-1) - m \cdot 0 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A - (m \cdot y) + y + m - 1 \\ &= m \cdot x + (-m) - 0 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A - (m \cdot y) + y + m - 1 \\ &= m \cdot x - m + (m \cdot y) \cdot A + y - (m \cdot y) - 1 + m \\ &= m \cdot x - m + m - (m \cdot y) + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A \\ &= m \cdot x + (-m + m) - (m \cdot y) + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A \\ &= m \cdot x + 0 - (m \cdot y) + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A \\ &= m \cdot x - (m \cdot y) + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $m \cdot s = m \cdot x - (m \cdot y) + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A$.
Again however, by Corollary 2.4.1, since $m, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$, we know $-(m \cdot y) = m \cdot (-y)$.
Putting everything together and again applying Definition 2.4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m \cdot s &= m \cdot x - (m \cdot y) + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A \\ &= m \cdot x + -(m \cdot y) + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A \\ &= m \cdot x + m \cdot (-y) + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A \\ &= m \cdot (x + (-y)) + (m \cdot 0) + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A \\ &= m \cdot (x + (-y)) + 0 + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A \\ &= m \cdot (x + (-y)) + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A \\ &= m \cdot (x - y) + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $m \cdot s = m \cdot (x - y) + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A$.
And since $(+, \cdot)$ are well defined, $m \cdot (x - y) + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A$ is a unique element.
So if $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ for some $x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and we have the following unique formula:

$$m \cdot s = m \cdot (x - y) + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A.$$

This unique formula will be very useful when we define Division By Scalars. Now, the last things that we need to do before moving onto S-Fields are to prove that $0 \neq 1$ and to show that this implies that multiplication in the S-Ring is not Associative. After that, we will finally have everything needed to introduce S-Fields.

Theorem 3.2.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Ring, then $0 \neq 1$.

Proof: Assume that $0 = 1$.
We know that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring.
So by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
And by Proposition 1.2.4, since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Structure, we know $\mathbb{S} \neq \mathbb{S}_0$.

Now, by Proposition 3.1.20, since $0 = 1$, we know $\mathbb{S}_0 = \{0\}$.
And by Theorem 3.2.1, we know $\mathbb{S}_0 = \Lambda$.
Therefore, we have $\Lambda = \mathbb{S}_0 = \{0\}$ implying $\Lambda = \{0\}$.

However, by Proposition 1.2.2, we know $\mathbb{S} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.
But since $\Lambda = \{0\}$, we have

$$\mathbb{S} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{S}_\alpha = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \{0\}} \mathbb{S}_\alpha = \mathbb{S}_0.$$

This implies $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S}_0$, which is a contradiction because $\mathbb{S} \neq \mathbb{S}_0$.
Therefore, we can conclude $0 \neq 1$.

Corollary 3.2.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Ring, then $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is not Associative.

Proof: Since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring, by Definition 3.2.1, it is an Essential S-Structure as well.
So by Definition 3.1.1, we know $0, 1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ has Standard Bases.
And by Definition 2.3.1, this means that $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_1$ exists.

Now, by Theorem 3.2.2, we know that $0 \neq 1$.
Therefore we know that $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_1$ and $0, 1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $0 \neq 1$.
So we can apply Proposition 2.5.1. to conclude that $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is not Associative.

3.3 S-Fields

We are going to create S-Fields by adding Scalar Inverses to S-Rings and finally show that S-Fields are extensions of Fields. We will then show two more basic properties that require Scalar Inverses to prove. This will complete the groundwork needed to introduce Division By Scalars and ultimately define the unique Division By Zero we are trying to create.

Definition 3.3.1 We say an S-Structure $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is a **Santangelo Field** (or **S-Field**) if $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ forms an S-Ring with Scalar Inverses, also called an Essential S-Structure with Unity and Scalar Inverses.

Since we have taken the time to build from the ground up, most properties about S-Fields have already been proven. This of course, is because an S-Field is an S-Ring, which is also an Essential S-Structure. Both of these S-Structures were just studied with great detail and the properties we have shown for both will be true in an S-Field as well. However, there are a few things left to prove about S-Fields that have not been proven yet. These proofs will be presented now. We begin by showing that S-Fields are S-Extensions of Fields.

Theorem 3.3.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field, then $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ forms a Field with Unity 1 where $e = 1$ is the Unity of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$.

Proof: We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field.
By Definition 3.3.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring (with Unity e) and with Scalar Inverses.
And by Corollary 3.2.1, $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ forms a Commutative Ring with Unity $e = 1$.

Now by Definition 2.7.1, $\forall x \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $x \neq 0$, $\exists x^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $x \cdot x^{-1} = x^{-1} \cdot x = 1$.
So $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ is a Commutative Ring with multiplicative inverses $\forall x \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $x \neq 0$.
Therefore $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ forms a Field with Unity 1 where $e = 1$ is the Unity of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$.

Corollary 3.3.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field, then $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Extension of a Field with Unity 1 where $e = 1$ is the Unity of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$.

Proof: We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring.
So by Definition 3.3.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure with Unity e.
And so, by Theorem 3.1.2, this implies $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Extension of $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$.
Furthermore, by Theorem 3.3.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ is a Field with Unity 1 where $e = 1$.

Therefore $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Extension of a Field with Unity 1 where $e = 1$ is the Unity of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$.

Now that we have finally shown that an S-Field is an extension of a Field, we're ready to define and explore Division By Scalars and Division By Zero. But before we move on, we have two quick propositions to prove that we will need to use later.

Proposition 3.3.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field, then $\forall x \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $x \neq 0$, we know x^{-1} is unique.

Proof: We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field.
So by Definition 3.3.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure with Unity and Scalar Inverses.
And by Definition 3.1.1, this means $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is S-Associative.

Let $x \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $x \neq 0$ and let $x_1^{-1}, x_2^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $x \cdot x_1^{-1} = x \cdot x_2^{-1} = e$.
Then by Definition 2.7.1, we know $\exists x^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $x \cdot x^{-1} = e$.
Therefore $x \cdot x_1^{-1} = x \cdot x_2^{-1} = e$ and $x \cdot x^{-1} = e$ implying

$$x \cdot x_1^{-1} = x \cdot x_2^{-1} = x \cdot x^{-1}.$$

Now by Definition 1.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is well defined implying

$$x^{-1} \cdot (x \cdot x_1^{-1}) = x^{-1} \cdot (x \cdot x_2^{-1}) = x^{-1} \cdot (x \cdot x^{-1}).$$

We showed $x, x_1^{-1}, x_2^{-1}, x^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure with Unity e.
And we know $x \cdot x_1^{-1} = x \cdot x_2^{-1} = x \cdot x^{-1} = e$.
Furthermore, by Definition 2.6.1, we know

$$e \cdot x_1^{-1} = x_1^{-1} \qquad e \cdot x_2^{-1} = x_2^{-1} \qquad e \cdot x^{-1} = x^{-1}.$$

We also know, by Proposition 3.1.13, that $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is Associative.
Putting all of these together, we have

$$\begin{array}{lcccccl} x^{-1} \cdot (x \cdot x_1^{-1}) & = & (x^{-1} \cdot x) \cdot x_1^{-1} & = & e \cdot x_1^{-1} & = & x_1^{-1} \\ x^{-1} \cdot (x \cdot x_2^{-1}) & = & (x^{-1} \cdot x) \cdot x_2^{-1} & = & e \cdot x_2^{-1} & = & x_2^{-1} \\ x^{-1} \cdot (x \cdot x^{-1}) & = & (x^{-1} \cdot x) \cdot x^{-1} & = & e \cdot x^{-1} & = & x^{-1}. \end{array}$$

Therefore, we can conclude

$$x^{-1} \cdot (x \cdot x_1^{-1}) = x_1^{-1} \qquad x^{-1} \cdot (x \cdot x_2^{-1}) = x_2^{-1} \qquad x^{-1} \cdot (x \cdot x^{-1}) = x^{-1}.$$

And so $x_1^{-1} = x_2^{-1} = x^{-1}$, which implies $\forall x \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $x \neq 0$, we know x^{-1} is unique.

Proposition 3.3.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field, then $1^{-1} = 1$.

Proof: We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field.
By Definition 3.3.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure with Unity and Scalar Inverses.
And by Definition 3.1.1, we know $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where, by Theorem 3.2.2, we know $1 \neq 0$.
Therefore by Definition 2.7.1, we know that 1^{-1} exists.

Now, by Proposition 3.2.1, we know $e = 1$ where e is the Unity of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$.
And since $1 \neq 0$, we know $e \neq 0$ implying, by Proposition 2.7.1, that $e^{-1} = e$.
Therefore $e = 1$ where $e^{-1} = e$, implying $1^{-1} = 1$.

3.4 An Example Of An S-Field

By Corollary 3.2.1, we know that $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ is a Commutative Ring for any S-Ring $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$, but we don't know which Commutative Ring it is. This presents a problem with our vocabulary because of course, an S-Ring which has $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)_1 = (\mathbb{R}, +_{\mathbb{R}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{R}})$ and one which has $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)_2 = (\mathbb{C}, +_{\mathbb{C}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{C}})$ would have very different properties and would not be the same S-Ring. And if we know only that an S-Ring is an S-Ring Extension of $(\mathbb{R}, +_{\mathbb{R}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{R}})$, we would not know if we had $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)_1$ or $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)_2$ as they both represent possible S-Ring Extensions of $(\mathbb{R}, +_{\mathbb{R}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{R}})$. However if we know that the S-Ring is a Proper S-Ring Extension of $(\mathbb{R}, +_{\mathbb{R}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{R}})$, then we would know right away that we had $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)_1$. This leads us to our next definition.

Definition 3.4.1 We say $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is a **Proper S-Extension Of** $(F, +_F, \cdot_F)$ if:

1) $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ forms an S-Extension Of $(F, +_F, \cdot_F)$.

2) $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot) \cong (F, +_F, \cdot_F)$.

At this time, we know what S-Fields are and we know how they work, however we have not yet proven that they exist. To change this, we will take a Commutative Ring $(R, +, \cdot)$ and use it to define an Algebraic Structure $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ which contains an addition operation $+_{\mathbb{S}}$ and a multiplication operation $\cdot_{\mathbb{S}}$ defined in terms of $(+, \cdot)$ from $(R, +, \cdot)$. We will then prove that $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is an S-Ring Extension of $(R, +, \cdot)$. In fact, this particular S-Ring Extension is a special type called a Proper S-Ring Extension of $(R, +, \cdot)$. This means that $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is not just an S-Ring Extension of $(R, +, \cdot)$, it's a Proper S-Ring Extension of $(R, +, \cdot)$. We will then show that if $(F, +, \cdot)$ is a Field, then $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is a Proper S-Field Extension of $(F, +, \cdot)$. This will not only prove that S-Fields exist, but it will prove that S-Rings exist as well.

Definition 3.4.2 Let $(R, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative Ring with Unity 1 and Additive Identity 0. We then make the following definitions:

We define $\mathbb{S} = R \times R$ where $R \times R$ is the Cartesian Product of R or

$$\mathbb{S} = \{(x, y) : x, y \in R\}.$$

Let $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{S}$, then $\mathbf{s} = (x, y)$ and $\mathbf{t} = (u, v)$ where $x, y, u, v, \in R$.
We define $\mathbf{0} = (0, 0)$ and $\mathbf{1} = (1, 0)$.
We also define the following operations:

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \mathbf{s} +_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{t} & = & (x, y) +_{\mathbb{S}} (u, v) & = & (x + u\,,\, y + v). \\ \mathbf{s} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{t} & = & (x, y) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (u, v) & = & (x \cdot u + y + v - x \cdot v - y \cdot u\,,\, y \cdot v + x \cdot v + y \cdot u). \end{array}$$

Therefore, we have taken the Commutative Ring $(R, +, \cdot)$ and created $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$.

The Algebraic Structure defined in Definition 3.4.2 will represent our example S-Field. We will first show that for a Ring $(R, +, \cdot)$, the above structure will form a Proper S-Ring Extension of $(R, +, \cdot)$. We will then show that for a Field $(F, +, \cdot)$, the above structure will form a Proper S-Field Extension of $(F, +, \cdot)$.

Theorem 3.4.1 Let $(R, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative Ring, then $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ from Definition 3.4.2 is an S-Ring where

$$(\mathbb{S}_0, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}}) \cong (R, +, \cdot).$$

This means that $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is a Proper S-Ring Extension of $(R, +, \cdot)$.

Proof: Let $(R, +, \cdot)$ be a Commutative Ring with Unity 1 and Additive Identity 0.
Let $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ be the Algebraic Structure defined in Definition 3.4.2.
We will first show that $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is an S-Ring.

1) Since $(R, +, \cdot)$ is a Ring, we know that $(R, +)$ is a Commutative Group.
Furthermore, we know $\mathbb{S} = R \times R$ where $R \times R$ is the Cartesian Product of R.
And since $\mathbf{s} +_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{t} = (x + u\,,\, y + v)$ is the standard addition on $R \times R$, we can conclude that $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}})$ is a Commutative Group with identity $\mathbf{0} = (0, 0)$ and inverses $-\mathbf{s} = (-x, -y)$ (see [2]).

We will use this to define Subtraction as $\mathbf{s} -_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{t} = \mathbf{s} +_{\mathbb{S}} -\mathbf{t}$.
So if $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{S}$ where $\mathbf{s} = (x, y)$ and $\mathbf{t} = (u, v)$, then $\mathbf{s} -_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{t} = (x - u\,,\, y - v)$.

2) Since $(R, +, \cdot)$ is a Ring, we know that $(R, +)$ and $(R, \cdot)$ are both closed.
So if $x, y, u, v \in R$, then $x \cdot u + y + v - x \cdot v - y \cdot u \in R$ and $y \cdot v + x \cdot v + y \cdot u \in R$.
This means that $\mathbf{s} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{t} = (x \cdot u + y + v - x \cdot v - y \cdot u\,,\, y \cdot v + x \cdot v + y \cdot u) \in R \times R$.
Therefore $\mathbf{s} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{S}$ and so $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is closed.

3) Since $(R, +, \cdot)$ is a Ring, we know that $0 \cdot n = 0$ for every $n \in R$.
Let $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{S}$ where $\mathbf{s} = (x, y)$ with $x, y \in R$ such that $y \neq 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s} &= (0,0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (x,y) \\ &= (0 \cdot x + 0 + y - 0 \cdot y - 0 \cdot x\,,\, 0 \cdot y + 0 \cdot y + 0 \cdot x) \\ &= (0 + 0 + y - 0 - 0\,,\, 0 + 0 + 0) \\ &= (y, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s} = (y, 0)$ where $(y, 0) \neq (0, 0)$, or $(y, 0) \neq \mathbf{0}$.
This means that $\exists \mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $\mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{0}$.

Putting these together, we see that $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is an S-Structure.
Furthermore, we know that $\mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s} = (y, 0)$.

So if $\mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{0}$, then $\mathbf{0} = (0, 0)$ implies $\mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s} = (y, 0) = (0, 0)$.
And since $\mathbb{S} = R \times R$ where $R \times R$ is the Cartesian Product, this means $y = 0$.
But if $\mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{0}$, then we know $\mathbf{s} = (x, y)$ where $y = 0$.
Therefore $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is an S-Structure where

$$\mathbb{S}_0 = \{(x, 0) : x \in R\}.$$

We can then show that if $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $\mathbf{m} = (m, 0)$, $\mathbf{n} = (n, 0)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{n} &= (m,0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (n,0) \\ &= (m \cdot n + 0 + 0 - m \cdot 0 - 0 \cdot n\,,\, 0 \cdot 0 + m \cdot 0 + 0 \cdot n) \\ &= (m \cdot n + 0 + 0 - 0 - 0\,,\, 0 + 0 + 0) \\ &= (m \cdot n, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\mathbf{m} = (m, 0)$ and $\mathbf{n} = (n, 0)$, then $\mathbf{m} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{n} = (m \cdot n, 0)$.

4) Since $(R, +, \cdot)$ is a Commutative Ring, we know that $(R, \cdot)$ is Commutative.
And again, we know that $(R, +)$ is Commutative as well.
So if $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{S}$ where $\mathbf{s} = (x, y)$ and $\mathbf{t} = (u, v)$ with $x, y, u, v \in R$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{s} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{t} &= (x,y) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (u,v) \\ &= (x \cdot u + y + v - x \cdot v - y \cdot u\,,\, y \cdot v + x \cdot v + y \cdot u) \\ &= (u \cdot x + v + y - u \cdot y - v \cdot x\,,\, v \cdot y + u \cdot y + v \cdot x) \\ &= \mathbf{t} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathbf{s} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s}$ and so we know $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is Commutative.

5) Since $(R, +, \cdot)$ is a Ring, we know that $(R, +, \cdot)$ is Distributive.
So if $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{S}$ where $\mathbf{s} = (x, y)$, $\mathbf{t} = (u, v)$ and $\mathbf{r} = (w, z)$ with $x, y, u, v, w, z \in R$,
then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{s} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{t} +_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{r}) &= (x,y) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} ((u,v) +_{\mathbb{S}} (w,z)) \\ &= (x,y) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (u + w, v + z) \\ &= (x \cdot (u + w) + y + v + z - x \cdot (v + z) - y \cdot (u + w)\,,\, y \cdot (v + z) + x \cdot (v + z) + y \cdot (u + w)) \\ &= (x \cdot u + x \cdot w + y + v + z - x \cdot v - x \cdot z - y \cdot u - y \cdot w\,,\, y \cdot v + y \cdot z + x \cdot v + x \cdot z + y \cdot u + y \cdot w). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, since $\mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s} = (y, 0)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{s} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{t} +_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s} &= (x \cdot u + x \cdot w + y + v + z - x \cdot v - x \cdot z - y \cdot u - y \cdot w\,,\, y \cdot v + y \cdot z + x \cdot v \\ &\qquad + x \cdot z + y \cdot u + y \cdot w) +_{\mathbb{S}} (y, 0) \\ &= (x \cdot u + x \cdot w + y + v + z - x \cdot v - x \cdot z - y \cdot u - y \cdot w + y\,,\, y \cdot v + y \cdot z + x \cdot v \\ &\qquad + x \cdot z + y \cdot u + y \cdot w) \\ &= (x \cdot u + x \cdot w + y + v + y + z - x \cdot v - x \cdot z - y \cdot u - y \cdot w\,,\, y \cdot v + y \cdot z + x \cdot v \\ &\qquad + x \cdot z + y \cdot u + y \cdot w) \end{aligned}$$

At the same time, we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{s} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{t}) +_{\mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{s} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{r}) &= ((x,y) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (u,v)) +_{\mathbb{S}} ((x,y) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (w,z)) \\
&= (x \cdot u + y + v - x \cdot v - y \cdot u\,,\, y \cdot v + x \cdot v + y \cdot u) +_{\mathbb{S}} (x \cdot w + y + z - x \cdot z - y \cdot w\,, \\
&\qquad\qquad y \cdot z + x \cdot z + y \cdot w) \\
&= (x \cdot u + y + v - x \cdot v - y \cdot u + x \cdot w + y + z - x \cdot z - y \cdot w\,,\, y \cdot v + x \cdot v + y \cdot u \\
&\qquad\qquad + y \cdot z + x \cdot z + y \cdot w) \\
&= (x \cdot u + x \cdot w + y + v + y + z - x \cdot v - x \cdot z - y \cdot u - y \cdot w\,,\, y \cdot v + y \cdot z + x \cdot v \\
&\qquad\qquad + x \cdot z + y \cdot u + y \cdot w) \\
&= \mathbf{s} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{t} +_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathbf{s} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{t} +_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s} = (\mathbf{s} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{t}) +_{\mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{s} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{r})$.
This means that $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is Wheel Distributive.

6) Since $(R, +, \cdot)$ is a Ring, we know that $(R, \cdot)$ is Associative.
So if $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{S}$ where $\mathbf{m} = (m, 0)$, $\mathbf{n} = (n, 0)$ and $\mathbf{s} = (x, y)$ with $m, n, x, y \in R$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
[(\mathbf{m} -_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{n} -_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1})] \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s}) &= [((m,0) -_{\mathbb{S}} (1,0)) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} ((n,0) -_{\mathbb{S}} (1,0))] \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s}) \\
&= ((m-1,0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (n-1,0)) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (y,0) \\
&= ((m-1,0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (n-1,0)) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (y,0) \\
&= ((m-1) \cdot (n-1), 0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (y,0) \\
&= (((m-1) \cdot (n-1)) \cdot y\,,\, 0) \\
&= ((m-1) \cdot (n-1) \cdot y\,,\, 0).
\end{aligned}$$

We also have that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{m} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{n}) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s} &= ((m,0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (n,0)) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (x,y) \\
&= (m \cdot n, 0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (x,y) \\
&= ((m \cdot n) \cdot x + 0 + y - (m \cdot n) \cdot y - 0 \cdot x\,,\, 0 \cdot y + (m \cdot n) \cdot y + 0 \cdot x) \\
&= (m \cdot n \cdot x + y - (m \cdot n) \cdot y - 0\,,\, 0 + m \cdot n \cdot y + 0) \\
&= (m \cdot n \cdot x + y - m \cdot n \cdot y\,,\, m \cdot n \cdot y).
\end{aligned}$$

This means that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{m} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{n}) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s} -_{\mathbb{S}} [(\mathbf{m} -_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{n} -_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1})] \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s}) &= (m \cdot n \cdot x + y - m \cdot n \cdot y\,,\, m \cdot n \cdot y) -_{\mathbb{S}} ((m-1) \cdot (n-1) \cdot y\,,\, 0) \\
&= (m \cdot n \cdot x + y - m \cdot n \cdot y - (m-1) \cdot (n-1) \cdot y\,,\, m \cdot n \cdot y - 0) \\
&= (m \cdot n \cdot x + y - m \cdot n \cdot y - (m-1) \cdot (n-1) \cdot y\,,\, m \cdot n \cdot y) \\
&= (m \cdot n \cdot x + y - m \cdot n \cdot y - (m \cdot n - m - n + 1) \cdot y\,,\, m \cdot n \cdot y) \\
&= (m \cdot n \cdot x + y - m \cdot n \cdot y - (m \cdot n) \cdot y + m \cdot y + n \cdot y - y\,, \\
&\qquad\qquad m \cdot n \cdot y) \\
&= (m \cdot n \cdot x + y - m \cdot n \cdot y - m \cdot n \cdot y + m \cdot y + n \cdot y - y\,, \\
&\qquad\qquad m \cdot n \cdot y) \\
&= (m \cdot n \cdot x - m \cdot n \cdot y - m \cdot n \cdot y + m \cdot y + n \cdot y - y + y\,, \\
&\qquad\qquad m \cdot n \cdot y) \\
&= (m \cdot n \cdot x - m \cdot n \cdot y - m \cdot n \cdot y + m \cdot y + n \cdot y + 0\,,\, m \cdot n \cdot y) \\
&= (m \cdot n \cdot x - m \cdot n \cdot y - m \cdot n \cdot y + m \cdot y + n \cdot y\,,\, m \cdot n \cdot y).
\end{aligned}$$

At the same time, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{m} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{n} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s}) &= (m,0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} ((n,0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (x,y)) \\
&= (m,0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (n \cdot x + 0 + y - n \cdot y - 0 \cdot x\,,\, 0 \cdot y + n \cdot y + 0 \cdot x) \\
&= (m,0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (n \cdot x + 0 + y - n \cdot y - 0\,,\, 0 + n \cdot y + 0) \\
&= (m,0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (n \cdot x + y - n \cdot y\,,\, n \cdot y) \\
&= (m \cdot (n \cdot x + y - n \cdot y) + 0 + n \cdot y - m \cdot (n \cdot y) - 0 \cdot (n \cdot x + y - n \cdot y)\,, \\
&\qquad\qquad 0 \cdot (n \cdot y) + m \cdot (n \cdot y) + 0 \cdot (n \cdot x + y - n \cdot y)) \\
&= (m \cdot (n \cdot x + y - n \cdot y) + 0 + n \cdot y - m \cdot (n \cdot y) - 0\,,\, 0 + m \cdot (n \cdot y) + 0) \\
&= (m \cdot (n \cdot x + y - n \cdot y) + n \cdot y - m \cdot (n \cdot y)\,,\, m \cdot (n \cdot y)) \\
&= (m \cdot (n \cdot x) + m \cdot y - m \cdot (n \cdot y) + n \cdot y - m \cdot (n \cdot y)\,,\, m \cdot (n \cdot y)) \\
&= (m \cdot n \cdot x + m \cdot y - m \cdot n \cdot y + n \cdot y - m \cdot n \cdot y\,,\, m \cdot n \cdot y) \\
&= (m \cdot n \cdot x - m \cdot n \cdot y - m \cdot n \cdot y + m \cdot y + n \cdot y\,,\, m \cdot n \cdot y) \\
&= (\mathbf{m} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{n}) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s} -_{\mathbb{S}} [(\mathbf{m} -_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{n} -_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1})] \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathbf{m} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{n} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s}) = (\mathbf{m} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{n}) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s} -_{\mathbb{S}} [(\mathbf{m} -_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{n} -_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1})] \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s})$.
This means that $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is S-Associative.

7) We know that $\mathbf{0} = (0,0)$ and $\mathbf{1} = (1,0)$.
And since $(R, +, \cdot)$ is a Ring, we know that $0 \cdot 0 = 0$ and $0 \cdot 1 = 0$.
This means that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{0} &= (0,0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (0,0) \\
&= (0 \cdot 0 + 0 + 0 - 0 \cdot 0 - 0 \cdot 0\,,\, 0 \cdot 0 + 0 \cdot 0 + 0 \cdot 0) \\
&= (0 + 0 + 0 - 0 - 0\,,\, 0 + 0 + 0) \\
&= (0,0) \\
&= \mathbf{0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1} &= (0,0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (1,0) \\
&= (0 \cdot 1 + 0 + 0 - 0 \cdot 0 - 0 \cdot 1\,,\, 0 \cdot 0 + 0 \cdot 0 + 0 \cdot 1) \\
&= (0 + 0 + 0 - 0 - 0\,,\, 0 + 0 + 0) \\
&= (0,0) \\
&= \mathbf{0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{0} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{0}$.
This means that $\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

8) Since $(R, +, \cdot)$ is a Ring with Unity 1, we know that $1 \cdot a = a$ for every $a \in R$.
So if $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{S}$ where $\mathbf{s} = (x, y)$ with $x, y \in R$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{1} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s} &= (1,0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (x,y) \\
&= (1 \cdot x + 0 + y - 1 \cdot y - 0 \cdot x\,,\, 0 \cdot y + 1 \cdot y + 0 \cdot x) \\
&= (1 \cdot x + 0 + y - 1 \cdot y - 0\,,\, 0 + 1 \cdot y + 0) \\
&= (1 \cdot x + y - 1 \cdot y\,,\, 1 \cdot y) \\
&= (x + y - y\,,\, y) \\
&= (x + 0, y) \\
&= (x, y) \\
&= \mathbf{s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathbf{1} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s}$ and since $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is Commutative, this means $\mathbf{s} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{s}$.
So $\mathbf{1} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{s}$, which means that $(\mathbb{S}, \oplus, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ has Unity $\mathbf{1}$.
And since $\mathbf{1}$ is the Unity of $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$, this means that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{1} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbb{S}_0 &= \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{S} : \mathbf{s} = (\mathbf{1} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{x}),\ \ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}_0\} \\
&= \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{S} : \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{x},\ \ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}_0\} \\
&= \mathbb{S}_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathbb{S}_0 = \mathbf{1} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbb{S}_0$ where again $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ has Unity $\mathbf{1}$.

Putting all of this together, we see that $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is an S-Ring.
We will now show that $(\mathbb{S}_0, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}}) \cong (R, +, \cdot)$.

Recall that $\mathbb{S}_0 = \{(x, 0) : x \in R\}$.
And since $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is an S-Ring, we know that $(\mathbb{S}_0, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is a Ring.
Define the function $\phi : (R, +, \cdot) \mapsto (\mathbb{S}_0, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$.
$$x \mapsto (x, 0)$$

Then we have the following:

9) Let $x, y \in R$ where $\phi(x) = \phi(y)$.
Since $\phi(x) = (x, 0)$ and $\phi(y) = (y, 0)$, this means that $(x, 0) = (y, 0)$.
And since $(\mathbb{S}, \oplus, \odot)$ is an S-Ring where $(x, 0), (y, 0) \in \mathbb{S}$, this means that $x = y$.
Therefore if $x, y \in R$ where $\phi(x) = \phi(y)$, then $x = y$ meaning that ϕ is one-to-one.

10) Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $\mathbf{x} = (x, 0)$ where $x \in R$.
And since $x \in R$, we know that $\phi(x) = (x, 0) = \mathbf{x}$.
Therefore if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}_0$, then $\exists x \in R$ such that $\phi(x) = \mathbf{x}$ meaning that ϕ is onto.

Putting 9 and 10 together, we see that ϕ is a bijection.
Furthermore, we have the following:

11) Let $x, y \in R$, then $\phi(x + y) = (x + y, 0)$.
But we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(x) +_{\mathbb{S}} \phi(y) &= (x, 0) +_{\mathbb{S}} (y, 0) \\ &= (x + y, 0 + 0) \\ &= (x + y, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\phi(x) +_{\mathbb{S}} \phi(y) = (x + y, 0) = \phi(x + y)$ implying $\phi(x + y) = \phi(x) +_{\mathbb{S}} \phi(y)$.

12) Let $x, y \in R$, then $\phi(x \cdot y) = (x \cdot y, 0)$.
But we already showed $(x, 0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (y, 0) = (x \cdot y, 0)$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(x) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \phi(y) &= (x, 0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (y, 0) \\ &= (x \cdot y, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\phi(x) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \phi(y) = (x \cdot y, 0) = \phi(x \cdot y)$ implying $\phi(x \cdot y) = \phi(x) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \phi(y)$.

So we know that ϕ is a bijection where $\phi(x+y) = \phi(x) +_{\mathbb{S}} \phi(y)$ and $\phi(x \cdot y) = \phi(x) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \phi(y)$.
Therefore, we can conclude that ϕ is an isomorphism and so

$$(\mathbb{S}_0, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}}) \cong (R, +, \cdot).$$

This means that $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ an S-Ring where $(\mathbb{S}_0, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}}) \cong (R, +, \cdot)$.
So by Definition 3.4.1, if $(R, +, \cdot)$ is a Commutative Ring, then $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is a Proper S-Ring Extension of $(R, +, \cdot)$.

Theorem 3.4.2 Let $(F, +, \cdot)$ be a Field, then $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ from Definition 3.4.2 is an S-Field where

$$(\mathbb{S}_0, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}}) \cong (F, +, \cdot).$$

This means that $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is a Proper S-Field Extension of $(F, +, \cdot)$.

Proof: Let $(F, +, \cdot)$ be a Field with Unity 1 and Additive Identity 0.
By Definition 3.3.1, we know that an S-Ring with Scalar Inverses is an S-Field
And since $(F, +, \cdot)$ is a Field, we also know that it is a Commutative Ring.
So by Theorem 3.4.1, we know that $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is a Proper S-Ring Extension of $(F, +, \cdot)$.
This means that $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is an S-Ring with $\mathbb{S}_0 = \{(x, 0) : x \in F\}$ such that

$$(\mathbb{S}_0, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}}) \cong (F, +, \cdot).$$

All that is left to show is that $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ has Scalar Inverses.

Now $(F, +, \cdot)$ is a Field, so $\forall x \in F$ where $x \neq 0$, we know $\exists x^{-1} \in F$ such that $x \cdot x^{-1} = 1$.
Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$, then $\mathbf{x} = (x, 0)$ with $x \in F$ such that $x \neq 0$.
So $x^{-1} \in F$ exists and if $\mathbf{x^{-1}} = (x^{-1}, 0)$, then $\mathbf{x^{-1}} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{x^{-1}} &= (x, 0) \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} (x^{-1}, 0) \\ &= (x \cdot x^{-1}, 0) \\ &= (1, 0) \\ &= \mathbf{1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathbf{x} \odot \mathbf{x^{-1}} = \mathbf{1}$.
However, since $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is an S-Ring, we know it is Commutative.
This means that $\mathbf{x^{-1}} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{x^{-1}} = \mathbf{1}$.
So if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$, then $\exists \mathbf{x^{-1}} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $\mathbf{x} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{x^{-1}} = \mathbf{x^{-1}} \cdot_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{1}$.
And so $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ has Scalar Inverses.

Therefore $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is a Proper S-Ring Extension of $(F, +, \cdot)$ with Scalar Inverses.
And so if $(F, +, \cdot)$ is a Field, then $(\mathbb{S}, +_{\mathbb{S}}, \cdot_{\mathbb{S}})$ is a Proper S-Field Extension of $(F, +, \cdot)$.

4 Division By Scalars And Division By Zero

We have finally put together an S-Field and have proven all of the properties needed to define and explore Division By Scalars and Division By Zero. This means that we have not only created the puzzle pieces needed, but we have also discovered how the pieces connect together. Effectively, we have assembled the puzzle. We now wish to see if the puzzle we created will display the beautiful picture that we had envisioned for it from the start, to define our unique Division By Zero.

This will be done by first defining and exploring the operation of Division By Scalars. We will define the operation and then prove a few important things about it. As we progress, we will see that this operation will satisfy many of the properties that division in a Field satisfies. We will then define what it means to be a Reversible Standard Base and prove a few important things regarding them. We will then define Division By Zero and prove that it satisfies all of the properties we had envisioned. We will again see that this operation will satisfy some of the properties that division in a Field satisfies as well. This should give the reader faith that this new Division By Zero operation is not just a novel idea. We then finish with three theorems that sum up all of the most important results and implications regarding S-Fields and Division By Zero.

4.1 Division By Scalars

In keeping with the style we used to develop S-Fields, we will develop Division By Scalars from the ground up. This means that we will define Division By Scalars in a generic fashion. We will then use the properties that we proved earlier about Essential S-Structures, S-Rings and S-Fields to investigate this Division By Scalars operation when it is defined in an S-Field.

Definition 4.1.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Structure, then we define **Division By Scalars** as the binary operation which takes $s \in \mathbb{S}$ and $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and produces $q \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $s = m \cdot q = q \cdot m$.

We write this as $\frac{s}{m} = q$ such that $s = m \cdot q = q \cdot m$.

Since an S-Field is an S-Ring, we can use the formula we developed to calculate $m \cdot s$ where $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $s \in \mathbb{S}$ to develop a unique formula for Division By Scalars.

Proposition 4.1.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field where $s \in \mathbb{S}$ and $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $m \neq 0$, then $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ for some $x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and Division By Scalars has the following unique formula:

$$\frac{s}{m} = m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A.$$

Proof: Let $s, q \in \mathbb{S}$ and $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m \neq 0$ and $s = m \cdot q$.

We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field.
So by Definition 3.3.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure with Scalar Inverses.
And by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Commutative.
Therefore, by Definition 1.1.4, this means $s = m \cdot q = q \cdot m$.
Furthermore, since $s \in \mathbb{S}$ and $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $s = m \cdot q = q \cdot m$, by Definition 4.1.1,

$$q = \frac{s}{m}.$$

By Proposition 3.2.3, we know $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ for some $x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
By Proposition 3.2.3, we also know $q = q_1 - 1 + q_2 \cdot A$ for some $q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Now $q \in \mathbb{S}$ and $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$, so by Proposition 3.2.4, this means

$$m \cdot q = m \cdot (q_1 - q_2) + q_2 - 1 + (m \cdot q_2) \cdot A.$$

And since $s = m \cdot q$ where $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$, we know

$$x - 1 + y \cdot A = m \cdot (q_1 - q_2) + q_2 - 1 + (m \cdot q_2) \cdot A.$$

Now, by Proposition 3.1.1, this means $x = m \cdot (q_1 - q_2) + q_2$ and $y = m \cdot q_2$.
And since $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m \neq 0$, by Definition 2.7.1, we know $\exists m^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Furthermore, by Definition 1.1.1, we know $(+, \cdot)$ are well defined operations.
Therefore $m \cdot q_2 = y$ implies $m^{-1} \cdot (m \cdot q_2) = m^{-1} \cdot y$.

Since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field, by Definition 3.3.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ has Unity e.
And by Proposition 3.2.1, we know $e = 1$ implying, by Definition 2.6.1, that $1 \cdot y = y$.
Furthermore, by Theorem 3.3.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}_0, \cdot)$ forms a Field, and so

$$\begin{aligned} m^{-1} \cdot (m \cdot q_2) &= (m^{-1} \cdot m) \cdot q_2 \\ &= 1 \cdot q_2 \\ &= q_2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $q_2 = m^{-1} \cdot (m \cdot q_2)$.
However, we know $m^{-1} \cdot (m \cdot q_2) = m^{-1} \cdot y$ and so $q_2 = m^{-1} \cdot y$.
And by Definition 1.1.2 of Subtraction, $\forall s, t \in \mathbb{S}$, we know $s - t = s + (-t)$.
Putting these together, since $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ forms a Field, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x &= m \cdot (q_1 - q_2) + q_2 \\ &= m \cdot (q_1 + (-q_2)) + q_2 \\ &= (m \cdot q_1) + (m \cdot (-q_2)) + q_2 \\ &= (m \cdot q_1) - (m \cdot q_2) + q_2. \end{aligned}$$

We can then substitute $q_2 = m^{-1} \cdot y$ in and see

$$\begin{aligned} x &= (m \cdot q_1) - (m \cdot q_2) + q_2 \\ &= (m \cdot q_1) - (m \cdot (m^{-1} \cdot y)) + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \\ &= (m \cdot q_1) - ((m \cdot m^{-1}) \cdot y) + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \\ &= (m \cdot q_1) - ((1) \cdot y) + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \\ &= (m \cdot q_1) - y + (m^{-1} \cdot y). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $x = (m \cdot q_1) - y + (m^{-1} \cdot y)$.
Again, since $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ forms a Field and $e = 1$, we know $1 \cdot q_1 = q_1$ and

$$\begin{array}{rcl} x & = & (m \cdot q_1) - y + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \\ x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y) & = & [(m \cdot q_1) - y + (m^{-1} \cdot y)] + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y) \\ x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y) & = & (m \cdot q_1) + [-y + (m^{-1} \cdot y) + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] \\ x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y) & = & (m \cdot q_1) + 0 \\ m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] & = & m^{-1} \cdot (m \cdot q_1) \\ m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] & = & (m^{-1} \cdot m) \cdot q_1 \\ m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] & = & (1) \cdot q_1 \\ m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] & = & q_1. \end{array}$$

Therefore $q_1 = m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)]$.
We also know $q_2 = m^{-1} \cdot y$, implying

$$\begin{array}{rcl} q & = & (q_1 - 1) + q_2 \cdot A \\ & = & m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A. \end{array}$$

And since $\frac{s}{m} = q$, we have $\frac{s}{m} = q = m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A$.
Since $(+, \cdot)$ are well defined, $q = m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A$ is unique.
Therefore, if $s \in \mathbb{S}$ and $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m \neq 0$, then $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ for some $x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and Division By Scalars has the unique formula

$$\frac{s}{m} = m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A.$$

With this formula for Division By Scalars, we can prove a few properties. As we will see, these properties will very much mirror the properties of division in a Field.

Proposition 4.1.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field and $m, n \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m \neq 0$, then

$$\frac{n}{m} = m^{-1} \cdot n.$$

Proof: Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m \neq 0$.
We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field.
So by Definition 3.3.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring with Scalar Inverses.
Then by Proposition 3.2.3, we know $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ for some $x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
And by Proposition 4.1.1, we know

$$\frac{s}{m} = m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A.$$

Now by Definition 2.7.1, since $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m \neq 0$, we know $m^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
So by Definition 1.2.1, we know $m^{-1} \cdot 0 = 0$.
And by Proposition 3.1.1, we know $0 \cdot A = 1$.
Furthermore, by Proposition 1.1.3, $\forall t \in \mathbb{S}$, we know $t - 0 = t$.

If we let $s = n$, then $s \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and by Proposition 3.1.1, we know $s = n = n - 1 + 0 \cdot A$.
Therefore $n = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ where $x = n$ and $y = 0$.
Putting all of this together, by the definition of identity, we have

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \frac{s}{m} & = & \frac{n}{m} & = & m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A \\ & & & = & m^{-1} \cdot [n + 0 - (m^{-1} \cdot 0)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot 0) \cdot A \\ & & & = & m^{-1} \cdot [n + 0 - (0)] - 1 + (0) \cdot A \\ & & & = & m^{-1} \cdot [n + 0] - 1 + 1 \\ & & & = & m^{-1} \cdot [n] + 0 \\ & & & = & m^{-1} \cdot n. \end{array}$$

Therefore $\frac{n}{m} = m^{-1} \cdot n$ where $m, n \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $m \neq 0$.

Proposition 4.1.3 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field and $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then

$$\frac{s}{1} = s.$$

Proof: Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$ and $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field.
So by Definition 3.3.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring, or Essential S-Structure with Unity e.
Then by Proposition 3.2.3, we know $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ for some $x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
And by Definition 3.1.1 and Proposition 3.2.1, we know $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $e = 1$.
Furthermore, by Proposition 4.1.1, we know

$$\frac{s}{m} = m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A.$$

Since $1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$, we can let $m = 1$ and by Proposition 3.3.2, this means $m^{-1} = 1^{-1} = 1$.
And since $e = 1$, we know $\forall t \in \mathbb{S}$, by Definition 2.6.1, that $e \cdot t = 1 \cdot t = t$ implying

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \frac{s}{m} & = & \frac{s}{1} & = & m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A \\ & & & = & 1 \cdot [x + y - (1 \cdot y)] - 1 + (1 \cdot y) \cdot A \\ & & & = & [x + y - y] - 1 + (y) \cdot A \\ & & & = & [x + 0] - 1 + y \cdot A \\ & & & = & x - 1 + y \cdot A \\ & & & = & s. \end{array}$$

Therefore $\frac{s}{1} = s$ where $s \in \mathbb{S}$.

Proposition 4.1.4 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field with $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$ and $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m \neq 0$, then

$$\frac{s}{m} + \frac{t}{m} = \frac{(s + t)}{m}.$$

Proof: Let $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$ and $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m \neq 0$.
We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field.
So by Definition 3.3.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure with Scalar Inverses.
And by Proposition 3.2.3, we know $s = x - 1 + y \cdot A$ and $t = u - 1 + v \cdot A$ for $x, y, u, v \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Furthermore, by Definition 2.7.1, since $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m \neq 0$, we know $m^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

By Proposition 4.1.1, we know $\frac{s}{m} = m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A$.
By Proposition 4.1.1, we also know $\frac{t}{m} = m^{-1} \cdot [u + v - (m^{-1} \cdot v)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot v) \cdot A$.
And by Theorem 3.3.1, $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ forms a Field.
Now, we have $x, y, u, v, m^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.
Putting all of this together, since $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ forms a Commutative Group and $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ forms a Field, we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \frac{s}{m} + \frac{t}{m} & = & m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A + m^{-1} \cdot [u + v - (m^{-1} \cdot v)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot v) \cdot A \\ & = & m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] + m^{-1} \cdot [u + v - (m^{-1} \cdot v)] - 1 - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A + (m^{-1} \cdot v) \cdot A \\ & = & m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y) + u + v - (m^{-1} \cdot v)] - 1 - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A + (m^{-1} \cdot v) \cdot A \\ & = & m^{-1} \cdot [x + u + y + v - (m^{-1} \cdot y) - (m^{-1} \cdot v)] - 1 - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A + (m^{-1} \cdot v) \cdot A \\ & = & m^{-1} \cdot [x + u + y + v - m^{-1} \cdot (y + v)] - 1 - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A + (m^{-1} \cdot v) \cdot A. \end{array}$$

By Definition 3.1.1 of Essential S-Structures, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive.
So by Definition 2.4.1, $\forall s, t, r \in \mathbb{S}$, we know $t \cdot s + r \cdot s = (t + r) \cdot s + 0 \cdot s$.
Furthermore, by Proposition 3.1.1, we know $0 \cdot A = 1$.

Putting all of this together, again since $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ forms a Commutative Group and $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ forms a Field, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{s}{m} + \tfrac{t}{m} &= m^{-1} \cdot [x + u + y + v - m^{-1} \cdot (y + v)] - 1 - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A + (m^{-1} \cdot v) \cdot A \\
&= m^{-1} \cdot [x + u + y + v - m^{-1} \cdot (y + v)] - 1 - 1 + ((m^{-1} \cdot y) + (m^{-1} \cdot v)) \cdot A + (0 \cdot A) \\
&= m^{-1} \cdot [x + u + y + v - m^{-1} \cdot (y + v)] - 1 - 1 + ((m^{-1} \cdot y) + (m^{-1} \cdot v)) \cdot A + 1 \\
&= m^{-1} \cdot [x + u + y + v - m^{-1} \cdot (y + v)] + 1 - 1 - 1 + ((m^{-1} \cdot y) + (m^{-1} \cdot v)) \cdot A \\
&= m^{-1} \cdot [x + u + y + v - m^{-1} \cdot (y + v)] + 0 - 1 + ((m^{-1} \cdot y) + (m^{-1} \cdot v)) \cdot A \\
&= m^{-1} \cdot [x + u + y + v - m^{-1} \cdot (y + v)] - 1 + ((m^{-1} \cdot y) + (m^{-1} \cdot v)) \cdot A \\
&= m^{-1} \cdot [x + u + y + v - m^{-1} \cdot (y + v)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot (y + v)) \cdot A.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\frac{s}{m} + \frac{t}{m} = m^{-1} \cdot [x + u + y + v - m^{-1} \cdot (y + v)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot (y + v)) \cdot A.$$

Now by Proposition 3.1.6, we know $s + t = (x + u) - 1 + (y + v) \cdot A$.
So by Proposition 4.1.1, we know

$$\frac{(s + t)}{m} = m^{-1} \cdot [(x + u) + (y + v) - m^{-1} \cdot (y + v)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot (y + v)) \cdot A.$$

Again, since $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group, we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{(s+t)}{m} &= m^{-1} \cdot [(x + u) + (y + v) - m^{-1} \cdot (y + v)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot (y + v)) \cdot A \\
&= m^{-1} \cdot [x + u + y + v - m^{-1} \cdot (y + v)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot (y + v)) \cdot A \\
&= \tfrac{s}{m} + \tfrac{t}{m}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\frac{s}{m} + \frac{t}{m} = \frac{(s + t)}{m}.$$

Proposition 4.1.5 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field, $s \in \mathbb{S}$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m \neq 0$, then

$$n \cdot (\frac{s}{m}) = \frac{(n \cdot s)}{m}.$$

Proof: Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m \neq 0$.
We know that $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field.
So by Definition 3.3.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring with Scalar Inverses.
And by Proposition 3.2.3, we know $s = (x - 1) + y \cdot A$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Furthermore, by Definition 2.7.1, since $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m \neq 0$, we know $m^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

Now by Proposition 4.1.1, we have

$$\frac{s}{m} = m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A.$$

We can let $u = m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)]$ and $v = (m^{-1} \cdot y)$,
then $\frac{s}{m} = u - 1 + v \cdot A$.

So by Proposition 3.2.4, we know

$$n \cdot \frac{s}{m} = n(u - v) + v - 1 + (n \cdot v) \cdot A.$$

Furthermore, we have $x, y, n, m^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and by Theorem 3.4.1, $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ is a Field.
By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.

Putting all of this together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
n \cdot \tfrac{s}{m} &= n(u-v) + v - 1 + (n \cdot v) \cdot A \\
&= n \cdot (m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] - (m^{-1} \cdot y)) + (m^{-1} \cdot y) - 1 + (n \cdot (m^{-1} \cdot y)) \cdot A \\
&= n \cdot (m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)]) - n \cdot (m^{-1} \cdot y) + (m^{-1} \cdot y) - 1 + (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A \\
&= (n \cdot m^{-1}) \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] - n \cdot (m^{-1} \cdot y) + (m^{-1} \cdot y) - 1 + (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A \\
&= (n \cdot m^{-1}) \cdot x + (n \cdot m^{-1}) \cdot y - ((n \cdot m^{-1}) \cdot (m^{-1} \cdot y)) - n \cdot (m^{-1} \cdot y) + (m^{-1} \cdot y) - 1 + (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A \\
&= (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot x) + (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) - (n \cdot m^{-1}) \cdot (m^{-1} \cdot y) - (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) + (m^{-1} \cdot y) - 1 + (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A \\
&= (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot x) + (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) - (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) + (m^{-1} \cdot y) - (n \cdot m^{-1}) \cdot (m^{-1} \cdot y) - 1 + (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A \\
&= (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot x) + 0 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) - (n \cdot m^{-1}) \cdot (m^{-1} \cdot y) - 1 + (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A \\
&= (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot x) + (m^{-1} \cdot y) - (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) - 1 + (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have

$$n \cdot \frac{s}{m} = (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot x) + (m^{-1} \cdot y) - (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) - 1 + (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A.$$

And now, by Proposition 3.2.4, we know $n \cdot s = n \cdot (x - y) + y - 1 + (n \cdot y) \cdot A$.
We can let $w = n \cdot (x - y) + y$ and $z = n \cdot y$, then $n \cdot s = w - 1 + z \cdot A$.

So by Proposition 4.1.1, we know

$$\frac{n \cdot s}{m} = m^{-1} \cdot [w + z - (m^{-1} \cdot z)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot z) \cdot A.$$

So $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ is a Field, $x, y, n, m^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with indentity 0 and inverses $-s$, implying

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{n \cdot s}{m} &= m^{-1} \cdot [w + z - (m^{-1} \cdot z)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot z) \cdot A \\
&= m^{-1} \cdot [n \cdot (x - y) + y + (n \cdot y) - m^{-1} \cdot (n \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot (n \cdot y)) \cdot A \\
&= m^{-1} \cdot [(n \cdot x) - (n \cdot y) + y + (n \cdot y) - (m^{-1} \cdot n \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot n \cdot y) \cdot A \\
&= m^{-1} \cdot [(n \cdot x) - (n \cdot y) + (n \cdot y) + y - (m^{-1} \cdot n \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot n \cdot y) \cdot A \\
&= m^{-1} \cdot [(n \cdot x) + 0 + y - (m^{-1} \cdot n \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot n \cdot y) \cdot A \\
&= m^{-1} \cdot [(n \cdot x) + y - (m^{-1} \cdot n \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot n \cdot y) \cdot A \\
&= m^{-1} \cdot (n \cdot x) + (m^{-1} \cdot y) - m^{-1} \cdot (m^{-1} \cdot n \cdot y) - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot n \cdot y) \cdot A \\
&= (m^{-1} \cdot n \cdot x) + (m^{-1} \cdot y) - (m^{-1} \cdot m^{-1} \cdot n \cdot y) - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot n \cdot y) \cdot A \\
&= (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot x) + (m^{-1} \cdot y) - (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) - 1 + (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have

$$\frac{n \cdot s}{m} = (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot x) + (m^{-1} \cdot y) - (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) - 1 + (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A.$$

But we showed

$$n \cdot \frac{s}{m} = (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot x) + (m^{-1} \cdot y) - (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) - 1 + (n \cdot m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A.$$

So we can conclude

$$n \cdot \frac{s}{m} = \frac{n \cdot s}{m}.$$

Corollary 4.1.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field, $s \in \mathbb{S}$ and $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m \neq 0$, then:

$$\frac{m \cdot s}{m} = s.$$

Proof: Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$ and $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m \neq 0$.
By Proposition 4.1.5 above, if $n \in \mathbb{S}_0$ we know $n \cdot \frac{s}{m} = \frac{n \cdot s}{m}$.
Therefore, if we let $n = m$, then

$$\frac{n \cdot s}{m} = \frac{m \cdot s}{m} = m \cdot \frac{s}{m}.$$

But by Definition 4.1.1, we know $\frac{s}{m} = q$ such that $m \cdot q = m \cdot (\frac{s}{m}) = s$.
Therefore $\frac{m \cdot s}{m} = m \cdot \frac{s}{m} = s$ implying

$$\frac{m \cdot s}{m} = s.$$

So we finally see that while an S-Field is a completely new algebraic structure with some properties that are completely new, like S-Associativity, Division By Scalars produces a division operation that has many of the properties that division in a Field has. We are now ready to explore Division By Zero.

4.2 Division By Zero

The time to define and explore Division By Zero is upon us. But before we jump right into defining it, we have to take a small but very necessary detour. Our goal is to define a different, unique answer for $\frac{\alpha}{0}$ where $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$. Doing this would be great, but we know that $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ which presents a problem. The reason that 0 is a problem is because we know that $\frac{0}{0}$ is indeterminate. In fact, we know that when $x = y$, the Difference Quotient as defined in a Calculus course is $\frac{f(y)-f(x)}{y-x} = \frac{0}{0}$. And when defining the derivative, a process is defined to essentially find an interpretation of $\frac{0}{0}$ for a particular function $f(x)$. We must have $\frac{0}{0}$ be indeterminate for this approach to work though. If we have a unique solution for $\frac{0}{0}$, we can no longer us the Difference Quotient to define a derivative. This means that we would lose the potential to define derivatives as we know them today.

To avoid this, we must develop $\frac{\alpha}{0}$ in a way that excludes $\alpha = 0$. But rather then just not include $\alpha = 0$ in the definition of Division By Zero because we don't like the results this would imply, the proper way to do this would be to develop a natural way of excluding $\alpha = 0$. This can be done by defining what it means for the Standard Base of $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$ to be Reversible. We will define Reversible Standard Bases and then show that the Standard Base of $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$ is Reversible for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ except $\alpha = 0$. After, we will use these concepts to finally define Division By Zero and not have to include $\alpha = 0$. We will then show that this operation satisfies all of the properties we have been hoping for this entire paper.

Definition 4.2.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an Essential S-Structure and let $\alpha \in \Lambda$. We say the Standard Base of $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$, denoted $q_0(\alpha)$, is **Reversible** if $\exists \alpha^* \in \Lambda$ such that

$$q_0(1) = \alpha^* \cdot (q_0(\alpha) + \alpha) - \alpha.$$

If $q_0(\alpha)$ is Reversible, we define $q_0^*(\alpha) = q_0(\alpha)$ as the **Reversible Standard Base of** $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$.

Proposition 4.2.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field. If $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$, then $q_0(\alpha)$ is reversible with $\alpha^* = \alpha^{-1}$.

Proof: We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field.
By Definition 3.3.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure with Unity e and Scalar Inverses.
So by Proposition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Coordinated.
And by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive and S-Associative with Standard Bases.

Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$, then by Definition 1.2.1, we know $\alpha \cdot 0 = 0$.
Now, by Theorem 3.2.1, we know $\mathbb{S}_0 = \Lambda$ and so $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ implies $\alpha \in \Lambda$.
Since $\alpha \in \Lambda$, by Definition 2.3.1, we know $q_0(\alpha) = \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1 \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ exists.
By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.
Putting all of this together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
q_0(\alpha) &= \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1 \\
q_0(\alpha) + 1 &= (\alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) - 1) + 1 \\
q_0(\alpha) + 1 &= \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) + (-1 + 1) \\
q_0(\alpha) + 1 &= \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) + (0) \\
q_0(\alpha) + 1 &= \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $q_0(\alpha) + 1 = \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1)$.
And by Definition 2.3.2, $A = q_0(1) + 1$ implying $q_0(\alpha) + 1 = \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) = \alpha \cdot A$.

Since $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$, by Definition 2.7.1, we know $\alpha^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $\alpha^{-1} \cdot \alpha = e$.
By Proposition 3.2.1, we know $e = 1$ implying $\alpha^{-1} \cdot \alpha = 1$.
So by Definition 2.6.1, we know $[(\alpha^{-1} - 1) \cdot (\alpha - 1)] \cdot 1 = [(\alpha^{-1} - 1) \cdot (\alpha - 1)]$
And by Proposition 3.1.1, we know $1 \cdot A = A$ and $0 \cdot A = 1$.
Furthermore, since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is S-Associative, by Definition 2.5.1, we know

$$\alpha^{-1} \cdot (\alpha \cdot A) = (\alpha^{-1} \cdot \alpha) \cdot A - [(\alpha^{-1} - 1) \cdot (\alpha - 1)] \cdot (0 \cdot A).$$

Putting all of this together, again since $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
q_0(\alpha) + 1 &= \alpha \cdot (q_0(1) + 1) \\
q_0(\alpha) + 1 &= \alpha \cdot A \\
\alpha^{-1} \cdot (q_0(\alpha) + 1) &= \alpha^{-1} \cdot (\alpha \cdot A) \\
\alpha^{-1} \cdot (q_0(\alpha) + 1) &= (\alpha^{-1} \cdot \alpha) \cdot A - [(\alpha^{-1} - 1) \cdot (\alpha - 1)] \cdot (0 \cdot A) \\
\alpha^{-1} \cdot (q_0(\alpha) + 1) &= (1) \cdot A - [(\alpha^{-1} - 1) \cdot (\alpha - 1)] \cdot (1) \\
\alpha^{-1} \cdot (q_0(\alpha) + 1) &= A - (\alpha^{-1} - 1) \cdot (\alpha - 1).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\alpha^{-1} \cdot (q_0(\alpha) + 1) = A - (\alpha^{-1} - 1) \cdot (\alpha - 1)$.
However, we know $A = q_0(1) + 1$ implying

$$\alpha^{-1} \cdot (q_0(\alpha) + 1) = q_0(1) + 1 - (\alpha^{-1} - 1) \cdot (\alpha - 1).$$

Now, by Theorem 3.3.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ forms a Field.
And since $1, \alpha, \alpha^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha^{-1} \cdot \alpha = 1$, this means that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\alpha^{-1} - 1) \cdot (\alpha - 1) &= \alpha^{-1} \cdot \alpha - \alpha^{-1} - \alpha + 1 \\
&= \alpha^{-1} \cdot \alpha - \alpha^{-1} - \alpha + 1 \\
&= 1 - \alpha^{-1} - \alpha + 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $(\alpha^{-1} - 1) \cdot (\alpha - 1) = 1 - \alpha^{-1} - \alpha + 1$.
By Proposition 1.1.2, we know $-(1 - \alpha^{-1} - \alpha + 1) = -1 - (-\alpha^{-1}) - (-\alpha) - 1$.
And also by Proposition 1.1.2, we know $-1 - (-\alpha^{-1}) - (-\alpha) - 1 = -1 + \alpha^{-1} + \alpha - 1$.

Putting this all together, since $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ forms a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha^{-1} \cdot (q_0(\alpha) + 1) &= q_0(1) + 1 - (\alpha^{-1} - 1) \cdot (\alpha - 1) \\
&= q_0(1) + 1 - (1 - \alpha^{-1} - \alpha + 1) \\
&= q_0(1) + 1 - 1 - (-\alpha^{-1}) - (-\alpha) - 1 \\
&= q_0(1) + 1 - 1 + \alpha^{-1} + \alpha - 1 \\
&= q_0(1) + 0 + \alpha^{-1} + \alpha - 1 \\
&= q_0(1) + \alpha^{-1} + \alpha - 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\alpha \cdot (q_0(\alpha) + 1) = q_0(1) + \alpha^{-1} + \alpha - 1$.
Since $\alpha^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Definition 1.2.1, we know $\alpha^{-1} \cdot 0 = 0$.
And we know $e = 1$, implying again, by Definition 2.6.1, that $\alpha^{-1} \cdot 1 = \alpha^{-1}$.
Furthermore, since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Wheel Distributive, by Definition 3.4.1, we know

$$\alpha \cdot (q_0(\alpha) + 1) = \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) + \alpha^{-1} \cdot 1 - \alpha^{-1} \cdot 0.$$

Putting all of this together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
q_0(1) + \alpha^{-1} + \alpha - 1 &= \alpha \cdot (q_0(\alpha) + 1) \\
&= \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) + \alpha^{-1} \cdot 1 - \alpha^{-1} \cdot 0 \\
&= \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) + \alpha^{-1} + 0 \\
&= \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) + \alpha^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $q_0(1) + \alpha^{-1} + \alpha - 1 = \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) + \alpha^{-1}$.
And since $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ forms a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
q_0(1) + \alpha^{-1} + \alpha - 1 &= \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) + \alpha^{-1} \\
(q_0(1) + \alpha^{-1} + \alpha - 1) + (-\alpha^{-1}) &= (\alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) + \alpha^{-1}) + (-\alpha^{-1}) \\
q_0(1) + \alpha^{-1} + \alpha - 1 + (-\alpha^{-1}) &= \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) + (\alpha^{-1} + (-\alpha^{-1})) \\
q_0(1) + \alpha - 1 + (-\alpha^{-1}) + \alpha^{-1} &= \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) + (0) \\
q_0(1) + \alpha - 1 + 0 &= \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) + (0) \\
q_0(1) + \alpha - 1 &= \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) \\
(q_0(1) + \alpha - 1) + (-\alpha + 1) &= \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) + (-\alpha + 1) \\
q_0(1) + ((\alpha - 1) + (-\alpha + 1)) &= \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) - \alpha + 1 \\
q_0(1) + (0) &= \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) - \alpha + 1 \\
q_0(1) &= \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) - \alpha + 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $q_0(1) = \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) - \alpha - 1$.
We know that $1 = \alpha^{-1} \cdot \alpha$ and that $\alpha^{-1} \cdot 0 = 0$.
And by Definition 2.4.1, we know $\alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) + \alpha^{-1} \cdot \alpha = \alpha^{-1} \cdot (q_0(\alpha) + \alpha) + (\alpha^{-1} \cdot 0)$.
Putting this all together, again since $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ forms a Commutative Group, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
q_0(1) &= \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) - \alpha + 1 \\
&= \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) - \alpha + \alpha^{-1} \cdot \alpha \\
&= \alpha^{-1} \cdot q_0(\alpha) + \alpha^{-1} \cdot \alpha - \alpha \\
&= \alpha^{-1} \cdot (q_0(\alpha) + \alpha) + (\alpha^{-1} \cdot 0) - \alpha \\
&= \alpha^{-1} \cdot (q_0(\alpha) + \alpha) + (0) - \alpha \\
&= \alpha^{-1} \cdot (q_0(\alpha) + \alpha) - \alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$, then $q_0(1) = \alpha^{-1} \cdot (q_0(\alpha) + \alpha) - \alpha$ where $\alpha^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
So we can conclude $q_0(\alpha)$ satisfies Definition 4.2.1 with $\alpha^* = \alpha^{-1}$ and is reversible.

Corollary 4.2.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field. If $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$, then $q_0^*(\alpha)$ exists and is unique.

Proof: Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$.
Then by Proposition 4.2.1 above, we know $q_0(\alpha)$ is reversible.
And by Definition 4.2.1, this means $q_0^*(\alpha) = q_0(\alpha)$ exists.

Since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field, by Definition 3.3.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring.
So by Theorem 3.2.1, we know $\Lambda = \mathbb{S}_0$ and so $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ implies $\alpha \in \Lambda$.
And by Proposition 2.3.1, since $\alpha \in \Lambda$, this means $q_0(\alpha)$ is unique.
Therefore, if $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$, then $q_0^*(\alpha) = q_0(\alpha)$ exists and is also unique.

So we know what a Reversible Standard Base is and we know that if $\alpha \neq 0$, then the Standard Base of $\mathbb{S}_\alpha$ is Reversible. But how do we know that the Standard Base of $\mathbb{S}_0$ is not reversible? Our next proposition will guarantee this.

Proposition 4.2.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field, then $q_0^*(0)$ does not exist.

Proof: Assume $q_0^*(0)$ exists.
We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field.
By Definition 3.3.1, this means it is an S-Ring, or an Essential S-Structure with Unity.
So by Definition 3.1.1, we know $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where, by Theorem 3.2.2, we also know $0 \neq 1$.

Since $q_0^*(0)$ exists, by Definition 4.2.1, $\exists 0^* \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $q_0(1) = 0^* \cdot (q_0(0) + 0) - 0$.
And since $0, 0^* \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Proposition 3.1.12, we must have $0^* \cdot 0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Furthermore, by Proposition 3.1.1, we know $q_0(0) = 0$.

We also know, by Proposition 1.1.3, that $\forall s \in \mathbb{S}$, we have $s - 0 = s$.
Putting all of this together, since 0 is the identity of $(\mathbb{S}, +)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_0(1) &= 0^* \cdot (q_0(0) + 0) - 0 \\ &= 0^* \cdot (q_0(0) + 0) \\ &= 0^* \cdot (0 + 0) \\ &= 0^* \cdot (0). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $q_0(1) = 0^* \cdot 0$ where we've shown that $0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $0 \neq 1$.
By Proposition 3.1.2, we know $1 \in \Lambda$ and by Definition 2.3.1, we know $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_1$.
And since $0^* \cdot 0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $q_0(1) = 0^* \cdot 0$, we have $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

Now $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_1$, so by Definition 1.2.1, this means $0 \cdot q_0(1) = 1$.
But since $q_0(1) \in \mathbb{S}_0$, by Definition 1.2.1, this means $0 \cdot q_0(1) = 0$.
So we have $0 \cdot q_0(1) = 0$ and $0 \cdot q_0(1) = 1$ implying $0 = 1$.
However, this is a contradiction because we know $0 \neq 1$.
Therefore, we can conclude that $q_0^*(0)$ does not exist.

We now have everything that is needed for Division By Zero. Since Reversible Standard Bases are a natural way of excluding $\alpha = 0$, they will be used in the definition.

Definition 4.2.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field. If $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$, we define the operation of **Division By Zero** as

$$\frac{\alpha}{0} = q_0^*(\alpha).$$

All that is left is to show the properties of our definition. In keeping with our analogy, we shall now show that the picture in the puzzle that we created does indeed look like the beautiful picture we had envisioned from the start.

Proposition 4.2.3 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field, then $\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$, we have $\frac{\alpha}{0} = q_0^*(\alpha)$ is a unique element and so Division By Zero is well defined.

Proof: We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field.
So by Definition 3.3.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring with Scalar Inverses.

Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$, then by Corollary 4.2.1, we know $q_0^*(\alpha)$ exists and is unique.
Furthermore, by Definition 4.2.2, we know $\frac{\alpha}{0} = q_0^*(\alpha)$.
Therefore, if $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$, then $\frac{\alpha}{0} = q_0^*(\alpha)$ exists and is a unique element.
So if $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$, then we can conclude that Division By Zero is well defined.

Proposition 4.2.4 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field, then $\frac{\alpha}{0} = q$ such that $0 \cdot q = q \cdot 0 = \alpha$ meaning that Division By Zero satisfies Definition 4.2.1 of Division By Scalars.

Proof: Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$.
Since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field, by Definition 3.3.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring.
By Theorem 3.2.1, we know $\Lambda = \mathbb{S}_0$ and so $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ implies $\alpha \in \Lambda$.

Since $\alpha \neq 0$, by Corollary 4.2.1, $q_0^*(\alpha)$ exists where, by Definition 4.2.1, $q_0^*(\alpha) = q_0(\alpha)$.
And since $\alpha \in \Lambda$, by Definition 2.3.1, we know $q_0(\alpha) \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ implying $q_0^*(\alpha) \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$.
So by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot q_0^*(\alpha) = \alpha$.
And since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring, by Definition 3.2.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
So by Definition 3.1.1, this means $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Commutative.
Therefore, by Definition 1.1.4, we can conclude $0 \cdot q_0^*(\alpha) = q_0^*(\alpha) \cdot 0 = \alpha$.

Now by Definition 4.2.2, we know $\frac{\alpha}{0} = q_0^*(\alpha)$.

So if we let $\frac{\alpha}{0} = q$, then $q = q_0^*(\alpha)$ and satisfies $0 \cdot q = q \cdot 0 = \alpha$.
Therefore $\frac{\alpha}{0} = q$ such that $\alpha = 0 \cdot q = q \cdot 0$ implying Division By Zero satisfies Definition 4.2.1, the definition of Division By Scalars.

Proposition 4.2.5 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field with $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$. If $\alpha + \beta \neq 0$, then

$$\frac{\alpha}{0} + \frac{\beta}{0} = \frac{(\alpha + \beta)}{0}.$$

Proof: Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$, $\beta \neq 0$ and $\alpha + \beta \neq 0$.
We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field.
So by Definition 3.3.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring, or Essential S-Structure with Unity e.
And by Definition 3.1.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ has Standard Bases.

Now, by Theorem 3.2.1, we know $\mathbb{S}_0 = \Lambda$ and so $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ implies $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$.
And by Proposition 2.3.1, since $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$, we know $q_0(\alpha)$ and $q_0(\beta)$ exist.
Therefore, by Proposition 3.1.5, we can conclude $q_0(\alpha) + q_0(\beta) = q_0(\alpha + \beta)$.

However, since $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$, by Corollary 4.2.1, $q_0^*(\alpha)$ and $q_0^*(\beta)$ exist.
And by Definition 4.2.1, we know $q_0^*(\alpha) = q_0(\alpha)$ and $q_0^*(\beta) = q_0(\beta)$.
Furthermore, by Definition 4.2.2, we know $\frac{\alpha}{0} = q_0^*(\alpha)$ and $\frac{\beta}{0} = q_0^*(\beta)$
Therefore $\frac{\alpha}{0} = q_0^*(\alpha) = q_0(\alpha)$ and $\frac{\beta}{0} = q_0^*(\beta) = q_0(\beta)$.

Putting this all together, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tfrac{\alpha}{0} + \tfrac{\beta}{0} &= q_0^*(\alpha) + q_0^*(\beta) \\ &= q_0(\alpha) + q_0(\beta) \\ &= q_0(\alpha + \beta). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\frac{\alpha}{0} + \frac{\beta}{0} = q_0(\alpha + \beta).$$

Since $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$, by Proposition 3.1.3, we know $\alpha + \beta \in \Lambda$.
So again, by Corollary 4.2.1, since $\alpha + \beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha + \beta \neq 0$, we know $q_0^*(\alpha + \beta)$ exists.
And again, by Definition 4.2.1, we know $q_0^*(\alpha + \beta) = q_0(\alpha + \beta)$.
Furthermore, by Definition 4.2.2, we know $\frac{\alpha+\beta}{0} = q_0^*(\alpha + \beta)$.

Putting this all together, we can conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \tfrac{\alpha+\beta}{0} &= q_0^*(\alpha + \beta) \\ &= q_0(\alpha + \beta) \\ &= \tfrac{\alpha}{0} + \tfrac{\beta}{0}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$ such that $\alpha + \beta \neq 0$, then

$$\frac{\alpha}{0} + \frac{\beta}{0} = \frac{\alpha + \beta}{0}.$$

Proposition 4.2.6 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field and $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$, then

$$\frac{\alpha}{0} - \frac{\alpha}{0} = 0.$$

Proof: Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$.
By Definition 4.2.2 of Division By Zero, we know $\frac{\alpha}{0} = q_0^*(\alpha)$.
This means that $\frac{\alpha}{0} - \frac{\alpha}{0} = q_0^*(\alpha) - q_0^*(\alpha)$.

But by Proposition 1.1.3, we know $q_0^*(\alpha) - q_0^*(\alpha) = 0$.
Therefore, we can conclude that $\frac{\alpha}{0} - \frac{\alpha}{0} = q_0^*(\alpha) - q_0^*(\alpha) = 0$ implying

$$\frac{\alpha}{0} - \frac{\alpha}{0} = 0.$$

As we can see, our definition for Division By Zero is yielding some interesting properties. Never before has one been able to guarantee that $\frac{\alpha}{0} - \frac{\alpha}{0} = 0$. This is something that is completely new and could possibly come in handy in applications of this Division By Zero. We will now explore $\frac{0}{0}$ and show that $\frac{0}{0}$ is indeterminate, just as we hoped it would be.

Proposition 4.2.7 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field, then $\frac{0}{0}$ cannot be defined using Definition 4.3.2 of Division By Zero.

Proof: Let Definition 4.2.2 of Division By Zero define $\frac{0}{0}$.
Then by Definition 4.2.2, this would mean $\frac{0}{0} = q_0^*(0)$ exists.

But this is a contradiction because by Proposition 4.2.2, $q_0^*(0)$ does not exist.
Therefore $\frac{0}{0}$ cannot be defined using Definition 4.2.2 of Division by Zero.

Proposition 4.2.8 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field, then $\frac{0}{0} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ is indeterminate.

Proof: By Proposition 4.2.7, we cannot use Definition 4.2.2 of Division By Zero to define $\frac{0}{0}$.
This means we must let Definition 4.1.1 of Division By Scalars define $\frac{0}{0}$.
So by Definition 4.1.1, we know $\frac{0}{0} = q$ such that $0 \cdot q = q \cdot 0 = 0$.

Since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field, by Definition 3.3.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring.
So by Proposition 3.2.3, we know $\exists q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that $q = q_1 - 1 + q_2 \cdot A$ where $s \in \mathbb{S}_{q_2}$.
And since $q \in \mathbb{S}_{q_2}$, by Definition 1.2.1, this means $0 \cdot q = q_2$.
However $0 \cdot q = 0$ implying $q_2 = 0$.

Now, we have that $q = q_1 - 1 + q_2 \cdot A$ where $q_1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $q_2 = 0$.
And since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring, by Definition 3.2.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
So by Definition 3.1.1 and Proposition 3.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is Commutative and $0 \cdot A = 1$.
By Definition 1.1.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +)$ is a Commutative Group with identity 0 and inverses $-s$.
Putting this all together, we have

$$\begin{aligned} q &= q_1 - 1 + q_2 \cdot A \\ &= q_1 - 1 + 0 \cdot A \\ &= q_1 - 1 + 1 \\ &= q_1 + ((-1) + 1) \\ &= q_1 + (0) \\ &= q_1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore if Definition 4.1.1 defines $\frac{0}{0}$, then $\frac{0}{0} = q$ where $q = q_1$ such that $q_1 \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Furthermore, our choice of q_1 was arbitrary and so $\frac{0}{0} = q$ where $q \in \mathbb{S}_0$ is arbitrary.
We can then conclude that $\frac{0}{0} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ is indeterminate.

We will now present three theorems which will express many important implications of S-Fields and of Division By Zero in S-Fields.

Theorem 4.2.1 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field. If $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$ are any elements in the S-Field and $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ is any Scalar of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$, then we have the following:

1) We know that $\exists x, y \in \mathbb{S}_0$ and $\exists u, v \in \mathbb{S}_0$ such that

$$s = x - 1 + y \cdot A \text{ and } t = u - 1 + v \cdot A.$$

2) Addition has the unique formula

$$s + t = (x + u) - 1 + (y + v) \cdot A.$$

3) Subtraction has the unique formula

$$s - t = (x - u) - 1 + (y - v) \cdot A$$

4) Multiplication By Scalarshas the unique formula

$$m \cdot s = m \cdot (x - y) + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A.$$

5) Division By Nonzero Scalars has the unique formula

$$\frac{s}{m} = m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A.$$

6) Division By Zero is defined when $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m \neq 0$ and has the unique formula

$$\frac{m}{0} = q_0^*(m).$$

7) Zero Divided By Zero has

$$\tfrac{0}{0} \in \mathbb{S}_0 \text{ is indeterminate.}$$

Proof: Let $s, t \in \mathbb{S}$ be elements in the S-Field and $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ be a Scalar of $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$.
By Definition 3.4.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring with Scalar Inverses.
And by Definition 3.2.1, $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is also an Essential S-Structure with Unity e.
Therefore, we have the following:

1) By Proposition 3.2.3, we know that $s = x + y \cdot A$ and $t = u + v \cdot A$ where $x, y, u, v \in \mathbb{S}_0$.

2) By Proposition 3.1.6, we know that $s + t$ has the unique formula
$s + t = (x + u) - 1 + (y + v) \cdot A$.

3) By Proposition 3.1.8, we know that $s - t$ has the unique formula
$s - t = (x - u) - 1 + (y - v) \cdot A$.

4) By Proposition 3.2.4, we know that $m \cdot s$ has the unique formula
$m \cdot s = m \cdot (x - y) + y - 1 + (m \cdot y) \cdot A$.

5) By Proposition 4.1.1, we know that $\frac{s}{m}$ has the unique formula
$\frac{s}{m} = m^{-1} \cdot [x + y - (m^{-1} \cdot y)] - 1 + (m^{-1} \cdot y) \cdot A$.

6) By Definition 4.2.2 and Proposition 4.2.3, if $m \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m \neq 0$, then
$\frac{m}{0}$ exists and has the unique formula $\frac{m}{0} = q_0^*(m)$.

7) By Proposition 4.2.8, we know that $\frac{0}{0} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ is indeterminate.

Theorem 4.2.2 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field, then $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ is a Field where $\frac{n}{m}$ is defined $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{S}_0$, except $m = n = 0$.

Proof: Let $m, n \in \mathbb{S}_0$.
Since $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field, by Theorem 3.3.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ forms a Field.
And by Definition 3.3.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Ring.
So we have the following:

1) If $m \neq 0$, then by Proposition 4.1.2, we know $\frac{n}{m} = m^{-1} \cdot n$ exists.
Therefore, if $m, n \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m \neq 0$, then we know $\frac{n}{m}$ is defined.

2) If $m = 0$ and $n \neq 0$, we know by Proposition 4.2.3 that $\frac{n}{0}$ is well defined.
This means that $\frac{n}{m} = \frac{n}{0}$ exists.
Therefore, if $m, n \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m = 0$ and $n \neq 0$, then we know $\frac{n}{m}$ is defined.

3) If $m = 0$ and $n = 0$, by Proposition 4.2.8, we know $\frac{0}{0} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ is indeterminate.
This means that $\frac{n}{m} = \frac{0}{0} \in \mathbb{S}_0$ is indeterminate.
Therefore, if $m, n \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $m = n = 0$, then $\frac{n}{m}$ is indeterminate.

Putting these together, we can conclude that $(\mathbb{S}_0, +, \cdot)$ is a Field where $\frac{n}{m}$ is defined $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{S}_0$, except $m = n = 0$.

Theorem 4.2.3 Let $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ be an S-Field, then $\frac{\alpha}{0} = q_0^*(\alpha)$ is a different, unique element $\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$.

Proof: We know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an S-Field.
So by Definition 3.3.1, we know $(\mathbb{S}, +, \cdot)$ is an Essential S-Structure.
Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$, $\beta \neq 0$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$.
By Proposition 4.2.1, this means $q_0^*(\alpha)$ and $q_0^*(\beta)$ exist.
And by Proposition 4.2.3, we know $\frac{\alpha}{0} = q_0^*(\alpha)$ and $\frac{\beta}{0} = q_0^*(\beta)$ are unique elements.

Assume that $q_0^*(\alpha) = q_0^*(\beta)$.
By Definition 1.1.1, we know that $(\mathbb{S}, \cdot)$ is well defined and so $0 \cdot q_0^*(\alpha) = 0 \cdot q_0^*(\beta)$.
And by Definition 4.2.1, we know that $q_0^*(\alpha) \in \mathbb{S}_\alpha$ and $q_0^*(\beta) \in \mathbb{S}_\beta$.
So by Definition 1.2.1, we know $0 \cdot q_0^*(\alpha) = \alpha$ and $0 \cdot q_0^*(\beta) = \beta$, implying $\alpha = \beta$.
This is a contradiction though because we know $\alpha \neq \beta$.
This means that if $\alpha \neq \beta$, then $q_0^*(\alpha) \neq q_0^*(\beta)$ or $\frac{\alpha}{0} \neq \frac{\beta}{0}$.

Therefore $\frac{\alpha}{0} = q_0^*(\alpha)$ is a different, unique element $\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{S}_0$ where $\alpha \neq 0$.

Conclusion

We finally defined Division By Zero! We did it by building a brand new algebraic structure called an S-Field from the ground up and then defining division operations to go with it. This process required many new ideas and concepts along the way. This process required out-of-the-box thinking and lots of creativity. But one notable thing that this process did not require was a major loss in algebraic properties. That is what makes this definition for Division By Zero so special. The fact that so many properties about division in a Field carry over to Division By Scalars and Division By Zero in an S-Field and that addition in an S-Field forms a Commutative Group should strongly imply that there could be some further implications and some possible applications of these concepts. Rather than just being a novel idea, like (arguably) almost every other attempt at Division By Zero appears to have been, this method of Division By Zero could be extremely applicable and answer open questions that have not been answered yet. And not just in mathematics but possibly in other areas, like physics and astrophysics.

With the new knowledge that is presented in this paper, possible applications must be investigated and either shown to be possible or impossible. It may turn out to be impossible to find any meaningful applications at all for this Division By Zero. At which point, one could at least rest at night knowing that this new Division By Zero just turned out to be a novel idea and not a ground breaking mathematical concept. But equally likely, it may turn out that it is possible to do such things or to find at least one meaningful application. Of course, the worst case scenario is that this turns out to be just a novelty, and in fact have absolutely no impact whatsoever on anything. But

in the best case scenario, the ideas here could open up a brand new branch of mathematics with all new results and new questions to ponder and answer. It could possibly answer current unanswered questions that could shed light on the unknown parts of our universe. I myself am very convinced that we will find the ideas and concepts introduced here to be the beginning of something great, the likes of which the mathematics community hasn't seen since Imaginary Numbers were introduced and became fully understood.

However to find out whether this would be a waste of your time or a path toward mathematical glory relies upon us to find out. We have to see if these concepts have potential and put them to the test. If any of the ideas you read in this article interest you, The Reader, I urge you to think about these things and see what you can come up with. A meaningful Division By Zero would be a game changer. By further studying S-Structures and the Division By Zero presented here, it is possible (and I believe inevitable) that you could become a part of the future by being a part of an emerging subject in Mathematics that could change everything we thought we knew. Thank you for reading.

References

[1] Carlström, Jesper: Wheels - On Division By Zero, Mathematical Structures in Computer Science, **14**(1), 143-184 (2004)

[2] Fraleigh, John B.: A First Course In Abstract Algebra, 4th Ed., 106. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, MA (1989)

[3] Hafstrom, John E.: Introduction To Analysis And Absract Algebra, 11-12. W.B Saunders Company, Philadelphia, PA (1967)

[4] Hall, F.M.: An Introduction To Abstract Algebra Volume 1, 2nd. Ed., 174-175. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1972)

[5] Papantonopooulou, Aigli: Algebra Pure And Applied, 46-47. Prentice-Hall Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ (2002)

[6] Rotman, Joseph: A First Course In Abstract Algebra. Prentice-Hall Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ (1996)